THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLI, No. 2 AUGUST, 1959

CONTENTS

The Church Defends Man ..... *Cardinal Ottaviani* 73

Mother of Christ ..... *Bishop Wright* 87

The Holy Spirit, the Church, the Individual: Father Hecker's Synthesis ... *George Hagmaier, C.S.P.* 95

Rerum Novarum in the San Francisco Strike of 1901 *Joseph S. Brusher, S.J.* 103

The Doctrinal Function of the Ecumenical Council *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 117

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

A Correction for *Sacerdos Caecutiens* 129

Candles at Sung Mass 129

Violet Vestments for Solemn Mass 130

Corpus Christi Procession 130

The "Penance" of a New Priest 131

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Psychological Difficulties of a Wife 132
Retreat Confessor as Substitute 133
Was Our Lady Ever Sick? 134
Invisible Members of the Church 134

BOOK REVIEWS

Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography. *Edited by H. H. Rowley* 136
In Remembrance of Me. *By Monsignor A. G. Martimort* ... 136
Shaping the Christian Message. *Edited by Gerard S. Sloyan* 137
World Crisis and the Catholic. *Edited by Sheed and Ward* .. 139
The Secular Journal of Thomas Merton 141

BOOKS RECEIVED 143

Department of Sacred Science
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences
Two-semester
INSTITUTE ON CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE
St. John's University

JAMAICA CAMPUS, GRAND CENTRAL & UTOPIA PKWYS., JAMAICA 32

By Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

Designed to meet the need of Priests, Religious and Teachers engaged in Guidance and Marriage Counselling.

Open to Graduate, Undergraduate & Special Students

Lectures and discussions will be conducted Fridays, 4:10 to 6 P.M. Saturdays, 9 A.M. to 12:35 P.M. on the following dates:

Oct. 23 & 24 Nov. 6 & 7 Nov. 13 & 14 Dec. 4 & 5 Jan. 8 & 9
Spring 1960 Semester will be held Feb., March & April

REGISTRATION: Early application suggested. Register Mon.—Sat., Sept. 14-19. Daily, 2 to 6:30 P.M.; Sat., 9 A.M. to noon.

For further information: Dean, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, St. John's University, Jamaica 32, N. Y., JAmaica 6-3700.

THE CHURCH DEFENDS MAN

It requires neither any great concentration nor any remarkably profound reflection to realize that man has never before been so endowed with tremendous resources in the fields of science, of comfort, and of pleasure, and, at the same time, so emptied of everything, even of himself. Never before has man attempted so many superhuman enterprises. Never before has he felt himself crushed by so many inhuman things.

If, by some prodigy, one of our ancestors were to return to life today, he would be speechless with astonishment at the sight of the amazing progress.

The earth has been traversed inch by inch. The most awesome distances have been travelled in a few hours. The very barriers of the skies have been passed. What more remains? After the conquest of the planetary regions, we are now preparing to invade the farthermost stellar spaces.

This calls to mind the words of the poet Horace:

> Audax omnia perpeti
> Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas . . .
> . . . Nil mortalibus arduum est:
> Coelum ipsum petimus stultitia.

A raging fever for discovery, ancient and ever new, consumes our minds. The days of Prometheus and of the giants are here again. Unfortunately the days of the tower of Babel have also returned. The more we listen to each other's talk, the less we understand one another's lives. The more we realize that we form one single family, one single nation, so much the more do we wrong one another, quarrel among ourselves, and kill one another. With all this progress it would seem that men have never suffered as much or feared as much as they suffer and fear today.

According to Rousseau, man, although born free, is in chains, and society is to blame. Now, however, man has broken all those bonds which Rousseau and his followers described as chains. He has put away the service of God and the pursuit of truth, and folly is in vogue. He has cast aside respect for tradition and civilization,

and barbarity is in fashion. Man has broken all his most sacred ties, and still he has never been so completely enchained as he is today.

But there is worse still. Man today has come to the position where he can be killed *en masse,* or exterminated. The very perfection that life has achieved has also, so to speak, been achieved by death. If pleasure has never before reached the pitch it has attained today, it is also true that suffering is greater than it has ever been before.

Look, for example, at the tyranny that has been prevalent in the world for almost half a century. In what previous time was it ever so widespread, so terrible, or so atrocious? An entire continent lies lifeless, crushed under the heel of the most massive and the most absolute cruelty. Not one but many nations are attacked, deceived, disarmed, bullied, and trampled upon. Recently we looked at Hungary. Only yesterday we saw Tibet.

No liberty at all, religious or civil or domestic, is being left for man any more. On the other hand we have seen deportation of human beings by the millions, unbearable oppression of a hitherto unheard-of crudity, and police control that combines an unparalleled cruelty with an effectiveness never realized before. All of this has gone on for many years, and has affected millions, even tens of millions, of people.

When in the course of history has man been so fierce against his fellowman? A kind of cannibalism, in the guise of social reform and under cover of politics and diplomacy, in the white gloves of lawful government, and armed with a vast and far-reaching network of espionage, is devastating the human race with impunity, and is destroying civilization. It aims at turning the world into a waste-land full of fear, and is actually succeeding in its attempt.

And yet, between the delirium of exaltation and the delirium of anguish, there stands the truth, and the truth is on the side of man. When nothing else and no one else comes to the defense of man, when science ignores him and philosophy denies him, he is greater than they are. The Church takes his part, and God, in the Church, takes his side also. Eternity enters the lists on the side of man, not against time and nature, since these too are God's works, but through time and through nature.

Let us not fear. All this tumult of cruelty and of error; all this fury of wickedness and of foolishness, is only the latest, the

most recent, mask the world has put on in its conflict against man. We know that the Lord has overcome the world. He overcame it hanging from a Cross, but, nonetheless, He has overcome it. And He continues to conquer it, today from our cross, as yesterday from His own. He conquered it crucified unto death in His flesh. He conquers it today, crucified in His Church. Then He conquered it for Himself and for His own. Now He overcomes it in His Saints and in His faithful.

He does not act in pomp and with clamor, nor with worldly abundance and in comfort. He does not act like a worldly conqueror, or like a hero in the pagan or semi-pagan stories. He triumphs in a way that only He knows and only He can. He conquers now as He conquered long ago. The world still goes on crucifying Him, and in this very crucifixion He goes on overcoming it.

He conquers the world, as I have said, through His Church. If heresy, or rather incredulity, today masks itself as a kind of humanism or humanitarianism which sacrifices man to the mass, the concrete to the abstract, and the real present to a fantastic future, it is the Church that strips this humanitarian mask off the world, and shows it for what it is, the accomplice of the devil and the slave of sin.

The Church accosts each man, and asks him to repeat, with all truth, the words of Paul: Jesus died for men, and delivered Himself for me (Cf. *Eph.*, 5:2). Jesus has given Himself for me, for me as an individual, and not for humanity. Certainly He has not excluded others. On the contrary He has included all. But He has delivered Himself, not for humanity in the abstract, but in the concrete, for men who have lived in the past, who are living now, and for those who will live in the future. He has given Himself for all men.

In a well known passage of his *Provincial Letters,* Pascal quotes a frightful saying: *omnia pro tempore, nihil pro veritate* (all things for the sake of time, nothing for the sake of truth). If the Church had to take this motto for itself, it would change it thus: Not everything for the sake of time, even though everything be for time in the light of eternity. Everything for the truth, all of the truth, and everything in the truth, even though everything be for man, for this individual man who lives today. In other words the Church considers the nature of the individual man in terms of

purposes and forces which transcend the earthly destiny. Thus it is not subject to judgment based on merely temporary standards.

Hence, anyone who would record the history of the Church, and would perceive and write only of its temporal sufferings and splendors, would be imitating the superficiality of those historians who frequently if not always stress the earthly aspect of heavenly things and the outward march of inward realities.

The Church, then, cannot be considered according to the norms of a merely civil society. It cannot be compared to anything that is merely of this world, with the greatest of the empires, with the most illustrious of the schools of learning, or with the most united of families. The Church is not what this man or that thought it ought to be, or made it. It is what Christ willed it to be and what He constituted it, and thus it must remain throughout the centuries. It is made to serve for the eternal salvation of each individual man. It sees the individual man and God. It considers this life as the prologue to another life, which alone is true life because it knows not death.

This certainly explains its intransigence in the defense of the truth, and of justice, and of the rights of man. It is acting for man's salvation. The world (in the sense that it is the domain of Satan, the prince of this world, and the enemy of the Church) hates God and wrongs man. The Church loves God and defends man. This is true history, as only a Christian can perceive it.

Let us consider nature itself. What is this created universe, which man can perceive with his thought, except a handful of dust, in comparison with the worlds of worlds which God could have created with the simplest act of His will? And, if actual creation be so little, then how small is the earth itself, and man who dwells upon the earth? And yet, for the sake of man, Jesus became Man. The Son of God became the Son of man for the sake of man.

He is the Son of God and of man. The rest is the earthly aspect of things, earthly rumor and noise, vanity and emptiness. For the salvation of this being, which the Son of God loved enough to bring Him to take its nature and to unite it in Himself in the unity of person with His own divine nature, for the salvation of this being, the Son of God became Incarnate, and the Church lives.

I am not a theologian, and certainly not an historian. In my younger days I tried to learn, and then to teach, the structure and

the laws of the Christian society and its relations with the civil society. In terms of this study, and without passing over into the areas of the professional theologian and historian, I would like to point out a few examples of the Church's constant activity, during the past centuries, in affirming, defining, and guarding the human person.

The first Christian centuries witnessed tremendous struggles about the divine Persons and the Divine Nature. These last few centuries have seen an attempt to destroy the very concept of God by men who believed that they could destroy God Himself, as Nietzsche dared to say publicly. And now we are viewing an attempt to disintegrate man. They have approached man in his nature and in his person as one would set about disintegrating a body by means of a chemical reagent. What constitutes man has been the subject of more than four centuries of experimentation, from the time of the so-called Rennaissance. One science after another has taken its turn in examining man. First came theology, then philosophy. Afterwards came the turn of psychology. And then it was a question of zoology. And, as if that were not enough, we are now being examined in terms of pure chemistry. First they took away man's soul, and then, his personality.

The period of history that lies between the fifteenth century and the twentieth, that is, from the time of humanism to that of humanitarianism with all its latest social and socialistic forms, is precisely the era during which man has been most glorified in words and most abased in fact. He is no longer the child of God and the king of the universe. He is rather a mere atom of an amorphous mass. In much the same way as the unhappy inmate of a prison, he is given a number and is condemned to a more or less distant, but still certain, death. Man is no longer being educated. He is merely being raised.

The lay and materialist state, which today is built less on armies and more on the laws of labor, production, traffic, and banking, is now brought to the bar of justice accused by politics itself, in favor of the have-not classes, which possess nothing, not even work.

Already at the end of the eighteenth century there appeared in the atmosphere of the French Revolution a movement, not of the middle classes, but of less fortunate men. That movement has been powerful in history. With the French Revolution the middle classes

wanted to supplant politically the monarchy, the nobility, and the clergy. They succeeded. The worker movement set out to supplant the middle classes in the state, and it succeeded. We are now in the midst of the storm. Perhaps we are on the crest of the highest wave. Those who have confiscated and monopolized the major forces of the worker movement today possess an empire which constitutes half the world, and which threatens the other half.

From the year 1500 until today, from political Protestantism to political communism, from the absolutism of the national monarchies to the absolutism of the Soviet Republics, from the colonial empires to the empire of the workers, there has never been a single voice raised in favor of man. He has been considered only as the soldier of an army, as the follower of a sect, as a militant whose sole function is to ensure the triumph of an idea, and as the hero of a conquest, an expedition, or of an invention. No one has ever considered him simply as man, solely for what he is. In the splendid celebrations of the past centuries, man's value has been reckoned not in terms of what he is but of what he has made. It is important to note that men spoke of art, of the sciences, of politics, of labor, and of everything that man does, but no one spoke of the man by whom all this was done.

That is, no one except the Church spoke of man. Even when a man is crippled or mentally deficient, he has, in the eyes of the Church, a dignity that comes immediately after that of God Himself. All the rest, in comparison with him, matters so little as to amount to almost nothing. And "all the rest" is the created universe and all history from beginning to end. The value of man's soul is what God cherishes most, since He has made Himself its ransom. At the very moment of man's creation God made man His adopted child, and shared with man His own life and His own nature by the gift of grace.

No one else but the Church has looked upon man and still looks upon him with the profound love and the total dedication of Jesus, who made Himself man for the sake of man. Thus He made every human being more sacred simply by reason of the fact that he is man. Religion itself is something that exists for the sake of man.

And, while we have seen that the State has gone so far as to sanction the violation of natural rights, as for example when sterilization for racial reasons was established or when the suppression

of offspring born defective was commanded or allowed, we have also seen the Church rise up against these violations of man's rights. It was on this point that the glorious battle of the Church was waged in the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge,* and in the Holy Office Decrees *De sterilizatione iniqua lege sancita,* and *Insortium occisione,* in which the lot of the afflicted was defended.

And in our days the position of the Church in the face of the social conflicts is designed entirely to conserve both charity and justice in recognizing the rights of all men, individually and collectively, and not merely the rights of one party.

The Church says that the social redemption is not to be found in class conflict, since social redemption does not exalt one section of society at the expense of another. That is endless social change, the rotation of various classes to the possession of power. The Church alone sees only man in the rich and in the poor, in the learned and in the unlearned, in the healthy man and in the invalid, in the handsome man and in the ugly man, in the talented and in the less gifted. Only the Church cares whether man is good or not. Only the Church can speak about redemption and know what it is talking about. And it is speaking about Jesus and about His Cross.

You know, of course, that the Church defends property itself as something belonging to a person. And you know that, in Christian thought, the state has no more right to be other than the servant of man than has the Church itself.

The state does not exist for its own sake, but for the sake of man. Art does not exist for its own sake, but for the sake of man. Even thought does not exist for the sake of thought, since it is something that belongs to man and is meant for him.

We must reject pleasure which is not ordered to a human destination, since this would be the ruin and the sacrilegious waste of human energy.

Power should not exist for the sake of power, nor wealth for the sake of wealth.

The world, like a beast with its vanity and cruelty, sees the Church rise up against it. Behind the world the devil stands, helping it. And the battle is being waged over man.

Leaving aside the thorny field of political history, let us turn to material that is closer to us, since it has to do with the Church in its intimate life.

You will recall that Protestantism treated the doctrine of God's activity in the work of our salvation just as badly as Pelagianism had treated it. Pelagius had so denied this divine activity or so explained it away that, when St. Augustine affirmed it, he appeared to press too hard, and the Church had to temper some of his theses.

On the other hand both Luther and Calvin, to say nothing of their medieval predecessors, saw in the affair of our salvation, God and only God. They denied all capacity for good in man. In their judgment, that capacity was not merely wounded but actually killed in the sin of Adam. Such ferocious teachings left no alternatives other than the blackest despair or the most abandoned libertinism. When grace was supposed to do everything, and everything by itself, moral activity lost all its meaning. And the libertines had no native land other than that of moral despair, dark and overrun with serpents.

But the attack made by these men on the doctrine of our salvation did not stop at this point. Besides denying man's capacity for good, they also wanted to attack the sheepfold of Christ itself. Under His Cross, they divided the garments of Jesus. They tore at the unity of the Church.

Scarcely a hundred years after the time of Luther and of Calvin, there broke out within the Church itself certain extremely bitter debates on a subject that is the basic, the ultimate, and the most sacred to every Christian soul. It had to do with the origin within the soul of life with God, and with the nature of that life itself. There were some who minimized the part which the human will plays in the meritorious act, almost to the point of explaining it away or destroying it altogether. They did this so that they might exalt and magnify the part which divine grace plays in the formation of this same act. On the other hand there were those who wished at all costs to defend the dignity of the human person, which God Himself has created and which He cannot deny. These people taught that man has, in the affair of his own salvation, an active part in which he is aided by God with an aid which does not destroy his free will.

Over all of these debates the Church sat in judgment. It did not allow anyone to take away from man what is his most precious crown and his most intimate nature. It saw to it that man was recognized as free in the sight of God, and above all in the sight of

God. And freedom is rightly the mother root, as it were, of the personality.

I shall not take the time to discuss in detail the *Congregationes de Auxiliis,* the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff at these debates, the innumerable arguments and counter-arguments, and the gigantic volumes that resulted from them. I only say that the hardest and perhaps the most difficult fight for the defense of man in the stronghold of his own freedom was fought and won within the confines of the Church by those who defended the cause of man. The Church was on their side.

A new conflict, not less noisy and vigorous, and no less prone to bitterness and loss of tempers also broke out about this same time. This one took place on the field of moral, rather than of dogmatic, theology. Where before the subject of discussion had been the meritorious act, now it was the moral act. In this battle also there was a tremendous consumption of printed paper. There were extensive and various discussions, which rose or sank at times to a degree of bitterness, and which not infrequently went to unauthorized extremes.

Let it be said in passing that two German scholars have written the history of these conflicts. Their scholarship was unrivalled in their own time, and it may not have been surpassed since. Both of them ended up outside of the Church, as "Old Catholics." I speak of Döllinger (1799-1890), and Reusch (1825-1900). One wrote on medieval sects, and the other on the index of forbidden books. Their writings are most learned, even if tendentious, and sometimes even less than honest. I recognize the fact that, in the history of the index, there is contained the history of the most important controversies in the history of scholarship. And, I have seen that, wherever the Church intervened in these controversies, it was evident that the cause of man had been in danger.

Incidentally these two scholars collaborated, in 1889, on a history of the disputes in moral theology between the laxists and the rigorists. Their work remains the most detailed history of these conflicts, despite its obvious imperfections.

Just as others had done before them in the field of dogmatic theology, a school of writers in the area of moral theology minimized freedom almost to the point of denying it altogether. They did this in order to exalt their concept of the law. Another school

substantially minimized the law, for the sake of their own concept of liberty. The Church would not allow the more rigid theories which stood against human freedom, even though these theories were founded on a faulty respect for God and a presumed consideration of the law. It may seem unimportant, but, I ask you, think of Jansenism. The Church's enemies, in order to give pain and offense to the Church, even today exalt Port Royal and quote Pascal. But which one of them today still will accept the theories of Port Royal?

A Saint like Alphonsus Liguori succeeded in combatting, within the Church, such great and false austerities, which were in reality the expressions of the pride of a new race of pharisees. He did this with his teaching in the field of moral theology and his pastoral works, which he spread abroad among the people, among the religious sisters, and among the humble clerics both secular and religious. He did it also by his devotions. His devotions were especially effective in this regard since, while they appeared to know nothing of the learned disputations, they actually and purposely disregarded these debates. Instead they were calculated to make people aware of basic certainties. They stressed the certainty of the fact that man is loved by God, and that this divine love invites and attracts man to love God in return. It reminded them of the certain truth that there is no love which is not free. The pernicious Jansenistic sophistries looked to a judgment that was mundane rather than Christian. They sought human rather than divine approval.

There is not much use in discussing human liberty which, in the face of a doubtful law, remains its own master and need not take the law into consideration. Jean Jacques Rousseau has something to say on this subject, and he was a great writer, a very bad philosopher, and an evil man. He claimed that man is born free, but that he is taken captive and put in chains by society. He meant here both civil and ecclesiastical society. The poor man never spoke about real moral freedom. He considered this a subject for debate among moralists, an affair of priests, something about which religious might dispute.

The essential point of this problem is to be found in the intimate freedom of man, that freedom from which every other liberty, like social and political liberty, derives its origin. Man is born free. He lives free and he dies free, but only if he refuses to surrender this

intimate liberty of his to any temptation or to any fear. Man, in the very act of obeying the law, gives his consent to that law by an act of his freedom. Otherwise he would act as an automaton. An outward respect is not enough to give the law. It is the heart which really obeys, and only the free can obey.

Freedom is in our souls like a fire that warms and gives light. It is the gift of gifts that God has lavished upon us. It is an incredible gift, in virtue of which we can even refuse and even deny God Himself. This is what the Church says. This is the truth that is required for the defense of the human person.

Finally we come to an even more important section of modern history, a history that deals not only with parliaments and armies, not only with ideas and customs, but which is mainly concerned with faith and with piety. Quietism arose from the smoldering fire of the *alumbrados,* and we know very well today that this was not the first time that fire had been lighted. The middle ages had in fact known more terrible conflagrations. In those times quietism led to the denial of the moral laws, of the sacraments, of authority, and even of the Church and of God Himself. And in those days it brought with it a final denial of man, since, in the act of mystical union with God, both man and God were supposed, as it were, to disappear, in a kind of new nirvana.

Here, too, it might seem that we were dealing with a subject of no importance. As a matter of fact, however, quietism shook the most pious people profoundly and raged like a dangerous fever. It affected men of the stature of Fenelon and of Cardinal Petrucci. The Christian prayer that rallied from its attack remained in a kind of state of shock, like something that has been struck with a hammer. But we find a Saint like Alphonsus standing between those who would reduce prayer to the delirium of a weakened mind and those who would construe it in the form of a rhetorical exercise. He stood firm against the attack which illuminism made against all prayer, and against Christianity itself. And Alphonsus put the most humble but the most enlightened prayers on the lips of our people. And the prayers of St. John of God were couched in even more popular terms. And our mothers spoke to God the words of St. Teresa of Avila.

Such was the prayer which was most effective in the sight of God. This is obvious from the fact that the most heroic sanctity arose

among the poor. It was found in people like St. Bernardette, St. Gemma Galgani, and the little martyr of Nettuno.

On the other hand, that quietism which cut such a poor figure in the world of theology has, according to some historians from Voltaire to Croce, powerfully influenced the movement known as romanticism. As a matter of fact there are certain theses in romanticism which we recognize as logical consequences of quietism. Among these theses are those on the autonomy of the passions, the futility of the law, the vanity of theological thought, the claim that everything in the line of sacred and profane authority is extraneous to the spirit, the notion that an immediate impulse, of whatever kind it may be, is always licit, the assertion that good, and true, and sentiment are all the same, so that whatever is felt is everything, and what is not felt is nothing.

In this context as in others the Church acted. As soon as it became aware of what was going on, it entered into the affair. It issued its definitions, and it put an end to the disputes.

But where, actually, was the center of the quietistic error? That center is actually to be found in the abolition of the human person, which became, so to say, completely absorbed in God in the act of mystical union. The annihilation which the mystics had spoken of in an analogical sense and symbolically, as something to be discussed judiciously, became for the quietists on the contrary a destruction of all social life, and became then a destruction of all interior spiritual life, which was reduced to a mysteriously vague act of union. Finally it became the equivalent of ontological annihilization, under the pretext that the person who is identified with God becomes entirely deified in everything. Thus in this system there remained nothing at all of man.

It is unfortunate that these old errors, which appear as eccentricities inconceivable in human beings who are subject to suffering and to death, and who know love and poetry, should have become over the course of the years, and precisely in our own times, even more murderous follies. Contemporary society has cast out the theologians as if they were sorcerers or fabricators of myths. It has made them its scapegoats. It tolerates them only on the condition that they cease to act as theologians and show themselves as philosophers.

In our own times man has been attacked by some philosophers, by positivists, statolators, totalitarians, and both by left wing and right wing existentialists. Some philosophers of our time, half Christian and half brute animal, but unfortunately inhuman in their approach, have had Hitler and Stalin as allies. Such is the fact.

Like the quietists, Hegel held that the individual is a kind of evil, something inferior, imperfect, and embryonic, which must be resolved into the universal spirit, the Idea. He held that only the state is capable of freedom and endowed with rights. Positivism arrived at the same conclusion by another way. It made the person a somewhat unimportant product of society.

Modernism followed tamely in the wake of positivism. It claimed to find in the corporate or social life the source, first of the *lex orandi,* and then of the *lex credendi.* According to Modernism, the Christian perception and the conscience of the individual comes from the Christian society. It sees the individual as a spark in a flaming mass.

According to this line of thought, the laws of chemistry, physics, and biology condition man's organism. In man the social laws condition, if they do not actually cause, the spiritual life. Man's will is no more free than a physiological reflex. According to Taine, man is a walking theorem, and his virtue is like one of the liquids in his body. "There is nothing real in me except the thread of events." And: "The soul is nothing but the always variable resultant of the multiple facts and complexes of life." The first of these is Taine. The second is Renan.

What is left of man according to these theories which are so hopeless and so distressing? We must remember that St. Thomas has written: "Person signifies that which is most perfect in all nature, that is a thing subsisting in a rational nature." And the Council of Trent has anathematized anyone who would dare to affirm that God would use man as a merely passive instrument.

The human person is the thing which the world today esteems least of all. And what the Church esteems most of all is precisely the human person. The person is our true countenance, the image in us of the divine light itself.

Society is a means. It is definitely not an end. The real end is found in each one of us, and it is the same as the end given to us by God. Man, attaining God by both natural and supernatural

means, attains himself. Entering into God's glory, he enters into his own glory. He is happy with the blessedness of God.

It is not only unlawful but impossible for man to attain this end alone, as a man outside of society, or as a Christian outside of the Church. By the very fact that he is created as a man, and by the very fact that he is a creature, man is essentially bound to the social life, to the family and to the state. He can be born a Christian, live as a Christian, and die a Christian only within the Church. But in spite of all this, the family, and the state, and even the militant stage of the Church itself will all eventually disappear. The human person will never pass away.

Such is the teaching of the Church, and all men should be grateful to the Church for that teaching.

ALFREDO CARDINAL OTTAVIANI

MOTHER OF CHRIST

When we hail Mary as Mother of Christ we implicitly proclaim all the other dignities and privileges which Catholic faith acknowledges and Catholic devotion venerates in her. Here is the key to all the mysteries of Mariology; here is the premise of all the doctrine and due cult of Mary.

The predestination of Our Lady, both with respect to her place in the divine economy and with respect to all of the graces required by that place, is necessarily linked to the predestination of Christ. All the demands and privileges of her predestination derive from their relation to His, as all her dignity depends on His.

The interrelation between the predestination of Mary and that of Christ, with the consequent dependence of her privileges on His, is set forth by Pope Pius IX in *Ineffabilis Deus* when the Holy Father writes:

> And hence the very words with which the Sacred Scriptures speak of Uncreated Wisdom and set forth His eternal origin, the Church, both in its ecclesiastical offices and its liturgy, has been wont to apply likewise to the origin of the Blessed Virgin, inasmuch as God, by one and the same decree, had established the origin of Mary and the Incarnation of Divine Wisdom.

Hence the validity of the reasonings of the theologians concerning the privileges which derive from the place of the Blessed Mother in the scheme of Redemption and in that order of grace which centers about the Incarnation; hence, too, the justification of the ecstasy with which Mary sang her Magnificat, the joy echoed in the praises that Catholicism has given her through all these twenty centuries of glorifying the Lord and rejoicing in the Saviour because of the divine motherhood which God granted Mary as the Mother of Christ.

Since the Council of Ephesus the recognition of Mary as the Mother of God, since she is Mother of Christ, has been essential to the integral Christian faith. Sober study and affectionate reflection on the divine maternity proclaimed at Ephesus have accounted for doctrinal and devotional developments which constitute the content of contemporary Mariology. These developments could be

presented in a detailed survey of orthodox Catholic doctrine concerning Mary and of authentic Catholic devotion to her, but they may also be succinctly stated in two brief, authoritative sentences from the *Fulgens Corona* of Pope Pius XII:

> A higher office than this [the divine motherhood] does not seem possible; since it requires the greatest dignity and sanctity after Christ, it demands the fullest perfection of divine grace and a soul free from every sin. Indeed, all the privileges and graces with which her soul and her life were endowed in so extraordinary a manner and measure, seem to flow from this sublime vocation of Mother of God, as from a pure and hidden source.

The infirm in faith strain at acceptance of certain privileges of Mary because they fail to perceive the implications which follow from the fact that Mary is the Mother of God. No Christian is likely to question that the Virgin is truly the Mother of Christ. The Scriptures leave no room for doubt concerning the univocal sense in which the Redeemer foretold by Old Testament prophecy would be born of a real mother; the Christ described in New Testament history was assuredly so born. The "seed of a woman," the Redeemer was a descendant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob according to the flesh; the child of a virginal mother, He was truly the fruit of her womb and the offspring of her flesh, a man, in all things like the rest of men except sin. The New Testament, in both its historical and exegetical books, leaves no confusion as to the complete humanity of Jesus and the true maternity of Mary.

The difficulties concerning the divine maternity of Mary derive, therefore, from inadequate or erroneous understanding concerning the Christ of whom Mary is truly the mother. The child of a mother is not a nature alone, but a person. True, no mother is the adequate cause of the personality of her child, since personality in every child not merely includes but is identified with the spiritual soul of which God alone is the author. Every mother gives to her child only the flesh of his human nature, but she is nevertheless the mother of her child as a person, even though God, by direct and individual creation, gives being to the soul which informs the personality of the child born of his mother. A woman mothers what she conceives, and a mother conceives a person, not merely a nature.

From Mary, Jesus derived the elements of His complete human nature, but the person that Mary conceived and of whom she is the

mother, is divine. There is mystery in this ineffable truth, of course, but the mystery, as St. Luke records Mary herself declared, surrounds how these things can be, not the fact that they are.

The doctrine of the divine maternity, the mystery that the Mother of Christ is the Mother of God, is veiled in wonder and eludes our human understanding. But it does so only because it is bound up with mysteries no less shrouded in the same wonder and elusive for the same reasons, above all the mystery, unmistakably true but beyond our power to tell, that Mary's son is at once true God and true man:

Credo . . . in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula. Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero. Genitum, non factum, consubstantialem Patri: per quem omnia facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem descendit de caelis. ET INCARNATUS EST DE SPIRITU SANCTO EX MARIA VIRGINE: ET HOMO FACTUS EST.

When, therefore, we salute Mary as Mother of Christ, we salute her also and at the same time as Mother of God. When St. Elizabeth asks, "Whence comes it that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" she is manifestly speaking of the same person as is Mary in her Magnificat, "My soul doth magnify the Lord!"

So Christians have understood from the beginning, and so the Church has taught both in the affirmation of positive Catholic doctrine and in the refutation of heresy, beginning with Gnosticism, Manichaeanism, Arianism, and Nestorianism. Let St. Cyril's account of why Mary is properly called *Theotokos* serve to summarize the teaching of tradition and to state the mind of the Church:

Therefore the Word indeed was God, but He became also man; and because He was born according to the flesh, because of His humanity it is necessary that she who gave birth to Him should be the Mother of God. For if she did not give birth to God, certainly neither will He be called God who was begotten of her. But if the divine Scriptures call Him God, she then gave birth to God made man, because a man could not otherwise come to be except through generation from a woman. How then is not she who bore Him the Mother of God? That He is true God who was born of her, we learn from the divine Scripture.

The Council of Ephesus unanimously approved the doctrine of Cyril as being, in fact, that of the Church, and from that day to this the cry of the crowds who heard the decrees of Ephesus has been the constant ejaculation of the Catholic faithful: "Holy Mary, Mother of God!"

* * * * *

As Mother of Christ Mary is somehow also Mother of mankind. If by begetting Christ and bringing Him into the world Mary became the Mother of God, so by the same maternity she became not only the mother of the Redeemer but the mother of the redeemed. Her maternity links her through Christ to God, but also through Christ to us. Here, too, the place of Mary in the total economy of salvation is given focus and the nature of the privileged relations between the devout and divinity are clarified. By grace we are the children of God, the brethren of Jesus. In the mystery of that grace we are assimilated to Christ in a supernatural life which gives us perforce a relationship to Mary and gives her a relationship to us. The Mother of my Redeemer is somehow my mother, too. St. Stanislas Kostka loved to repeat a claim consistent with the strictest theological accuracy and comprehensible to every Catholic mind as well as heart: "The Mother of God is my mother."

Here, too, is mystery profound and ineffable, but the mystery, again, surrounds how these wonders can be, not whether and what they are. When we speak of the spiritual maternity of Mary, of the Mother of Christ as the mother of all the redeemed, we speak a mystery, but we are not without insights to help us understand the mystery.

The spiritual maternity by which Mary is mother of divine grace for us is, in the very nature of things, dependent upon that "headship" of the race and of grace by which Christ both represents us before the Mercy Throne of the Father and serves as the incarnate source of God's grace to us. It is through the hypostatic union that the humanity of Christ becomes the source of the spiritual life to which we are re-born; it is through the intimacy of the relation between the mother and her child, between Mary and Christ, that Mary acquires the role in our supernatural re-birth by which she becomes the new Eve, the spiritual mother of redeemed mankind.

Theologians are presently engaged in the effort to understand something, at least, of what we mean by these marvelous titles that the Church has not hesitated to give the Blessed Virgin, all of which derive from the central, supreme fact that she is Mother of Christ. The devout clients of Mary read with eager interest the speculations of theologians as to the why's and wherefore's, but the essential truths concerning the spiritual maternity which are beyond dispute find frequent and unmistakably clear affirmation. The learned Pope Benedict XIV states the Catholic faith concerning Mary's spiritual maternity thus: "The Catholic Church, schooled by the Holy Ghost, has always most diligently professed, not only to venerate Mary most devoutly as *the Mother of the Lord and Redeemer* . . . but also to honor her . . . as *the most loving Mother* who was left her by the last words of her dying Spouse." Popes Gregory XVI and Pius IX seem almost to quote one another, the first speaking of "the Virgin Mother of God and the most loving Mother of us all," and the latter praising "the most Holy Mother of God, and the most loving mother of us all, the Immaculate Virgin Mary." Pope Leo XIII is explicit: "Just as the most Holy Virgin is the Mother of Jesus Christ, so she is the Mother of all Christians," and Pope Benedict XV speaks of Mary as, "she who gave birth to the 'Prince of Peace,' and who is the benign Mother of the human race."

Most of the Popes, as most of the theologians who speak of Mary's spiritual maternity, appeal to the words spoken by Jesus to St. John on Calvary as providing a basis for the doctrine of the spiritual maternity of Mary. This exegesis of Christ's "testament on the cross" has become a commonplace in Catholic preaching and devotional literature, as well as in the speculations of the theologians. Pope Leo XIII may be said to speak for both categories of writers when, writing of the words of Jesus to John, he says: "Now in John, according to the constant mind of the Church *(quod perpetuo sensit Ecclesia)*, Christ designated the whole human race *(in Joanne... Christus designavit personam humani generis)*."

However, Mary's spiritual motherhood, so dramatically proclaimed on Calvary, did not begin there. The Mother of Christ did not become our mother by any mere "delegation" or extrinsic relationship of appointment or proxy as the result of Christ's "testament on the cross." The maternal relationship of Mary to the

redeemed appears to many theologians to be intrinsically bound up with our spiritual regeneration and with her maternal relation to the incarnate source of our re-birth to grace and to salvation. Indeed, authentic Catholic teaching strongly suggests that Mary is as literally the spiritual mother of redeemed mankind as Eve is the physical mother of our race, and that this is true for like and parallel reasons. Pope Benedict XV gives typical expression to this common line of thought when he declares: "For, as the first Adam had a woman as his associate in the Fall, so the second Adam willed that there participate in the reparation of our salvation she whom, by styling her 'Woman' from the Cross, He declared to be the second Eve, that is, the ineffable sorrowing Mother of all men, for whom He was dying, to win life for them."

St. Pius X set forth the intrinsic nature of the relationship between the fact that Mary is the Mother of Christ and the fact that she is our Mother also. He argued that it was at the Incarnation itself that Mary began the maternal relationship to us that was proclaimed, not inaugurated, at Calvary. In the hour of the Incarnation the Virgin conceived the Redeemer of mankind, not only the physical Body of Christ, but also His Mystical Body. In the very begetting of Christ lies the origin of Mary's spiritual maternity.

The saintly Pope wrote:

For is not Mary the Mother of Christ? She is, therefore, our Mother also. Indeed everyone must believe that Jesus, the Word made Flesh, is also the Saviour of the human race. Now, as the God-Man He acquired a body composed like that of other men, but as the Saviour of our race He had a kind of spiritual and mystical Body, which is the society of those who believe in Christ. "We, the many, are one body in Christ" (*Romans,* 12:5). But the Virgin conceived the Eternal Son not only that He might be made man by taking His human nature from her, but also that by means of the nature assumed from her He might be the Saviour of men. For this reason the angel said to the shepherds, "Today in the town of David a Saviour has been born to you, Who is Christ the Lord" (*Luke,* 2:11). So in one and the same bosom of His most chaste Mother, Christ took to Himself human flesh and at the same time united to Himself the spiritual body built up of those "who are to believe in Him" (*John,* 17:20). Consequently Mary, bearing in her womb the Saviour, may be said to have borne also all those whose life was contained in the life of the Saviour. All

of us, therefore, who are united with Christ and are, as the Apostle says, "Members of His body, made from His flesh and from His bones" (*Ephesians,* 5:30), have come forth from the womb of Mary as a body united to its head. Hence, in a spiritual and mystical sense, we are called children of Mary, and she is the Mother of us all. "The Mother in spirit . . . but truly the Mother of the Members of Christ, which we are" (St. Augustine, *De sancta virginitate,* ch. 6). If then the Most Blessed Virgin is at once the Mother of God and of men, who can doubt that she makes every effort to bring it about that Christ, "head of His body, the Church" (*Colossians,* 1:18), infuses His gifts into His members, and above all that we might know Him and "live through Him" (*I John,* 4:9)?

Truly, then, when we say "Mother of Christ" we announce the adequate premise for the sound Mariological doctrine and orthodox Marian devotion which have developed in the living Church through centuries of devout reflection on that title. Christ means the Anointed One, the Prophet, the King and the High Priest of all mankind. But Christ is the Lord's Anointed, united to the Godhead in a unique wondrous unity. He is also the Head of all the Redeemed, uniting them to Himself in a life of grace which intimately identifies them in and with the life Christ shares with the Godhead. Though the Lord's Anointed, Christ is not alien to us; He is our New Adam, at union with the redeemed as Adam was one with the race.

So it is with each of the offices of Christ. He is our Prophet, but not as one sent from outside us to speak to us in strange and alien accents. Rather, in the mystery of the Incarnation, He is, though come from God, risen from among us. "A great prophet is risen up among us," the Jews acknowledged, and the words have a greater meaning than they supposed, in terms of Christ's identity with those to whom He is the Prophet.

Christ is our King, not as a conqueror from afar, but as a king from our own ranks and tribe. His kingdom is not of this world, but He sits upon the throne of David, our spiritual forefather, and He is born, as the wise men from the East understood, King of the Jews, our spiritual kinsmen.

As with His kingship, so with the priesthood of Christ. It is based on a bond between Him and heaven, but it includes as an essential element the intimate ties between Him and us.

Of Christ in all these offices, Mary is the mother. Of us in all our relations to Christ, *our* Anointed One as well as the Lord's, *our* Prophet, Priest and King, Mary is, by the same token and at the same time, the mother, all because she is Mother of Christ.

In the successive titles by which the Blessed Mother is praised in the Litany of Loreto we are constantly reminded that Mary is the Mother of Christ. All her other titles derive their point and efficacy from this central claim Mary has to the veneration of mankind and the gracious deference of God Himself. Each of the titles of Mary mirrors some single facet of the central jewel in her crown, the regal jewel that identifies her as Mother of Christ.

✠ JOHN J. WRIGHT

Bishop of Pittsburgh

THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE CHURCH, THE INDIVIDUAL: FATHER HECKER'S SYNTHESIS

The history of the Church is pock-marked with the tragic failures of zealous, deeply spiritual men and women who have chosen to overlook the vital interaction of the Holy Spirit with the authority of the Church. The student of history has only to recall the heresies which have done most to rend the seamless robe of Christ, and he will realize that the basic error of so many of them was the distortion of the role of the Holy Spirit in His relation to the individual soul, and to the Church which He vitalizes as its Soul. Montanism, Donatism, the Anabaptist movement, Quakerism, Jansenism, Quietism, Methodism, and all the modern Protestant off-shoots of those well-intended but wayward rebellions spring from the same flaw.

The danger is contained in this question: If the Holy Spirit is dwelling within my soul, ready to guide my every action, ready to lead me from evil and toward good, what need have I of an external authority, of a Church?

No one saw the difficulties or the dangers inherent in this question more clearly than did Father Isaac T. Hecker, the American convert and founder of the Paulist Fathers. It is one hundred years since the foundation of Hecker's American religious community and seventy years since his own death. Yet his doctrine on the relationships between the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the individual remains even today as one of the most cogent presentations yet devised to explain the teaching of the Church on this most important issue.

Many of Hecker's insights into the problem of these relationships came as a result of his own spiritual adventures. From his earliest years, he had been singularly guided by the direct inspirations of the Holy Spirit.[1] Yet he tells us that until his conversion to Catholi-

[1] "From my childhood," he related, "God influenced me by an interior light and by the interior touch of his Holy Spirit." (Walter Elliott, C.S.P., *The Life of Father Hecker* [New York: Columbus Press, 1894], p. 420.) This devotion remained so constant and so deep a part of his religious life, that towards the end of his years Hecker was able to declare: "I am quite indifferent, quiet, ready entirely either not to act or to act. An act of entire faith in the personal guidance of the Holy Spirit, and complete

cism at the age of twenty-three, he was ill-at-ease, and often strangely in doubt.[2] Though he never doubted that the Holy Spirit was guiding him, he was not certain that *every* inspiration was from above. He noted in his early diary, for example: "There was a confession [among the group of Transcendentalists assembled with young Hecker at the Fruitlands experiment] of the obstacles which prevent us from attaining the highest aim. Mine was the doubt whether light *is* light; not the want of will to follow. . . ."[3] Later on Father Hecker defined the *Transcendentalism* which his associates at Fruitlands and elsewhere had espoused. It was "theoretically an assertion of the immanence of divinity in instinct, the transference of supernatural attributes to the natural constitution of mankind. . . . Through all was the belief in the living God in the soul, faith in the immediate inspiration, in boundless possibility, in unimaginable good."[4]

Father Hecker believed in the presence of the living God in the soul, he had faith in immediate inspiration, and he looked to the "boundless possibilities and unimagined good" which flowed from docile response to such interior guidance. But he knew he needed more; he needed a yardstick of judgment; he needed a voice of

---

confidence in its action in all things—in its infinite love, wisdom, power; that it is under its influence and promptings up to now my life has been led. Though not clearly seen or known, He has directed every step." *The Paulist Vocation* (New York: The Missionary Society of Saint Paul the Apostle), p. 59.

[2] In his later years Father Hecker wrote, "It seemed to me . . . Divine Providence had led me as it were by the hand, through the different ways of error . . . in order that having made known to me the truth He might employ me the better to point out to non-Catholics the way to His Church." (*The Paulist Vocation, op. cit.*, p. 36.) Even without the personal testimony of Father Hecker himself, the truth of the statement cannot be doubted. Those who knew him well, from his earliest days to the end of his life, friends, spiritual directors, high ecclesiastics, his fellow religious, all testify to the accuracy of Father Hecker's own accounts of his singular guidance by the Holy Spirit. For those interested in Hecker's life the first volume of his definitive biography has just been completed: *The Yankee Paul* by Vincent F. Holden, C.S.P., Ph.D. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1958).

[3] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[4] Isaac Hecker. *The Church and The Age* (New York: Office of the Catholic World, 1887), p. 314.

assurance, testifying to the validity of his interior convictions. He needed the Church.

A notation in his dairy during his pre-conversion days asks: "Why should I not be satisfied when I am living, growing. . . . I have the life—is not that the end?"[5] But he knew it was not the end. "God had given me such an amount of infused lights and graces," he writes elsewhere, "that I was forced to seek a guide or go into extravagant fanaticism."[6] He was *forced* to seek the authority of the Church.

From the first, Father Hecker saw the necessity of the Church for all, regardless of the extent to which the individual soul is guided by the Holy Spirit. "The authority and discipline of the Church (are) safeguards to the soul from being led astray from the paths of the Holy Spirit."[7]

Notice that there is no conflict between the authority of the Church and the promptings of the Holy Spirit. There cannot be. Father Hecker was to stress this truth again and again as the core of his teaching on the action of the Holy Spirit upon the individual. He summed up his doctrine on this point in these words: "For the Divine Spirit embodied in the *Church* and the Divine Spirit indwelling in every Christian *soul* are one and the same Divine Spirit and they bear testimony to each other, and work together for the same end."[8] "One and the same Spirit"—that is why there can be no conflict.

It is *through* the Church that the Holy Spirit communicates a full measure of Himself to the individual soul: ". . . The indwelling Holy Spirit is the divine life of the Church and . . . her Sacraments have for their end to convey the Holy Spirit to the Soul."[9] Thus the chief office of the Church established by Christ is to serve as the conduit through which the Holy Spirit may give Himself to men, performing thereby the work of their sanctification. "It is the divine action of the Holy Spirit in and through the Church," declares Father Hecker, "which gives her external organization the reason for its existence."[10] And again, "The Holy Spirit, of which the Church is the organ and expression, places every soul, and therefore

[5] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[7] Hecker, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 276.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

all nations and races, in the immediate and perfect relation with their supreme end, God, in whom they obtain their highest development, happiness and glory, both in this life and in the life to come."[11]

What the Holy Spirit desires for the Church, He desires for the individual souls He guides within the Church. Where there is a contradiction, there must be an error—and that error is always on the part of man. "The Church is divine," says Father Hecker, "moved by the instinct of the Holy Spirit, in all her supreme and vital acts. . . . Whoso fails to recognize this permanent divine action in the Church, the light of the Holy Spirit has departed from his soul, and he thereby becomes external to the Church."[12]

It was the unwillingness of the so-called Reformers to adhere to this all-important truth that brought on the terrible chaos of Protestantism. "The nature of Protestantism," writes Father Hecker, "may be defined as the exaggerated development of personal independence, directed to the negation of the divine authority of the Church. . . ."[13] To be led by the Spirit does not mean private infallibility. It is on this very point that Hecker rejects Luther: "The cause of all the [debate] at the Diet of Worms was not personal judgment . . . (but) the right application of personal judgment. . . . A divine revelation necessitates a divine interpreter."[14] He applies the same apologetical principle to the private interpretation of the Bible: "A book divinely inspired requires for its interpreter the divine Spirit to get at its meaning. Now if those who assume to possess this Spirit contradict each other point-blank in their interpretation of its meaning, then this is equivalent to charging the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, with error; and such a charge is blasphemy!"[15] Hence the absolute necessity of an authoritative Church to double-check, as it were, the individual lights which her members receive personally.

Father Hecker lived his convictions. Though his soul was constantly under the powerful direction of the Spirit dwelling almost sensibly within him, yet no where can there be found a more docile and reverent son of the Church. During one of his many spiritual

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 146.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[14] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
[15] Hecker, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

trials he wrote: "I had one way of telling that I was not like Martin Luther; in my inmost soul I was ready, entirely ready, to submit to the judgment of the Church."[16]

The proposed formal definition of Papal infallibility, projected as the chief work of the Vatican Council, was met at the time with mixed reactions from the hierarchy of the Church. While scarcely any questioned the truth of the dogma, there were some few who felt it might be then inopportune to proclaim the formal definition. No man was more sensitive to the possible effects of this promulgation upon the non-Catholic world than Father Hecker. It is interesting to read his reactions to the deliberations of the Council. "I have always heard the voice of Rome as truth itself . . .," he wrote; "All I have to say is, that if the Roman Court prevail, it is the Holy Ghost who prevails through the Roman Court."[17] When the dogma was eventually defined, Father Hecker asserted: "None but the declared enemies of the Church and misdirected Catholics can fail to see in this the directing influence of the Holy Ghost."[18] He even saw in this definition the advancement of his own hopes for a greater and wider attention to the individual directives of the Holy Spirit: "The definition of the Vatican Council, having rendered the supreme authority of the church . . . more explicit and complete, has prepared the way for the faithful to follow, with greater safety and liberty, the inspirations of the Holy Spirit."[19]

Notice, again, that the authority of the Church is not a *substitute* for the guidance of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Father Hecker does not hesitate to assert flatly: "The immediate guide of the Christian soul is the Holy Spirit."[20] As he explains: "The Holy Spirit, having taken up His abode in the Christian soul and become its abiding guest, enlightens, quickens, and strengthens it to run in the way of perfection. . . . Here, then, is the key to all the secrets of the economy of the Catholic Church concerning spiritual life. Hence the reception of the sacraments, the exercise of Church authority, and the practice of virtue are never presented as a substitute for, but as subservient to, the immediate guidance of the soul by the indwell-

[16] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 267.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 365.
[19] Hecker, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

ing Holy Spirit."[21] Father Hecker insists: "Authority is always secondary to something else as its end, and never an end in itself.... The authority of the Church is subservient to the attainment of the end for which the Christian religion was revealed—that is, the promotion and safeguard of the action of the indwelling Holy Spirit by which the soul is united to God."[22]

Those who might grow uneasy in reading the latter passage can see Father Hecker's orthodoxy reaffirmed in his next sentence: "But supposing there is a conflict between the divine external authority of the Church and the abiding Holy Spirit in the soul, what then? . . . Why, then the reign of nonsense!!! For if the Holy Spirit acting through the authority of the Church as the teacher and interpreter of divine revelation contradicts the Holy Spirit acting in the soul as its immediate guide, then God contradicts God! Can anything be more absurd than this supposition? It is enough to know that the action of God in the Church and action of God in the soul never have come and never can come into conflict. The Holy Spirit is the immediate guide of the soul; but," says Father Hecker, "the Divine Spirit established the Church as the practical and perfect means of bringing all souls under His own immediate guidance. . . ."[23]

Here is a paragraph from the *Exposition* which sums up in Father Hecker's own words, the precise relationship between internal and external spiritual authority: "The Holy Spirit in the external authority of the Church acts as the infallible interpreter and criterion of divine revelation. The Holy Spirit in the soul acts as the Divine Life-giver and Sanctifier. It is of the highest importance that these two distinct offices of the Holy Spirit should not be confounded. The supposition that there can be any opposition, or contradiction, between the action of the Holy Spirit in the supreme decisions of the authority of the Church and the inspirations of the Holy Spirit in the soul, can never enter the mind of an enlightened and sincere Christian. The Holy Spirit, which through the same authority of the Church teaches divine truth, is the same Spirit which prompts the soul to receive the divine truths which He teaches. The measure of our love for the Holy Spirit is the measure

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 219.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 198.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

of our obedience to the authority of the Church. . . . There is one Spirit, which acts in two different offices concurring to the same end, the regeneration and sanctification of the soul."[24]

Father Hecker is plain in his disavowal of the possibility of conflict between external and internal direction. When there is apparent conflict, the answer is simple: the individual has deceived himself. The Church alone is capable of infallible judgment. But what of doubt? What if the individual is not sure what the interior Spirit is leading him to do or to believe? Father Hecker's answer is the same: "In case of obscurity or doubt concerning what is the divinely revealed truth, or whether what prompts the soul is or is not an inspiration of the Holy Spirit, recourse must be had to the Divine Teacher or criterion, the authority of the Church. . . . The test, therefore, of a truly enlightened and sincere Christian will be, in case of uncertainty, the promptitude of his obedience to the voice of the Church."[25]

How beautiful is this exposition of the relationship of the Christian soul with Christ's Church, both infused and led ahead by the gentle suasion of the Divine Spirit of God. This dual action, which, as Father Hecker ever insisted, is essentially "one inseparable synthesis," makes possible the highest advancement of the Church, and of every soul who understands correctly the workings of the Holy Spirit. As Father Hecker said, there are two extremes which must be avoided. To stress only the interior action of the individual soul without considering the place of the authority of the Church, "would open the door to delusions, errors, and heresies of every description, and would be in effect only another form of Protestantism." On the other hand, to ignore the monumental reality of the Indwelling Holy Spirit and His work in the soul and be concerned exclusively with the external authority of the Church "would render the practice of religion formal, obedience servile, and the Church sterile."[26]

In contrast to this, Father Hecker sums up his entire approach by pointing out the happy balance: "The Holy Spirit is the immediate guide of the soul in the way of salvation and sanctification; and the criterion, or test, that the soul is guided by the Holy Spirit,

[24] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 395.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 395.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

is its ready obedience to the authority of the Church. This rule removes all danger whatever, and with it the soul can walk, or fly, if it chooses, in the greatest safety and with perfect liberty, in the ways of sanctity."[27]

GEORGE HAGMAIER, C.S.P.

New York, N. Y.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for August 1909, contributed by the learned Sulpician, Fr. A. Vieban, is entitled "Modernism and Protestantism." The author asserts that the chief source of Modernism was Liberal Protestantism, and quotes many statements of Protestant authors to prove that they upheld the same ideas that were condemned by Pope Pius X in the decree *Lamentabili.* . . . Writing on "The English Convert Movement," Fr. W. Lescher, O.P., describes the factors characteristic of the many conversions to the Catholic faith in England, from the sixteenth century down to the present day. There has always been in that country a line of distinction between the converts and the "old Catholics," although Fr. Lescher asserts that, despite this distinction "the Catholics and the converts amalgamated to make one solid, compact body which by degrees grew into a vigorous organization." . . . Fr. A. Coughlan, C.SS.R., writes on "St. Clement Hofbauer," the Redemptorist priest, who was the apostle of Vienna in the early part of the nineteenth century, and was canonized in May, 1909. . . . Fr. W. D. Strappini, S.J., in his article "History from the Dust" describes some interesting and humorous writings found on the tablets and papyri of Egypt, 4000 years ago, like the letter of a small boy, threatening not to eat or drink if his father does not send him a lyre. Fr. Strappini tells us: "The familiar letter, the unstudied words of friend writing to friend, the little cares of the day, from out of their unhonored grave they come to link us with the cords of Adam to men and women of the past." . . . Three chapters of Canon Sheehan's *The Blindness of the Reverend Dr. Gray* appear in this issue. . . . The *Analecta* contain the Bull of Pope Pius X establishing the Pontifical Institute for Biblical Studies in Rome. . . . In the *Studies and Conferences* we find a practical article on the type of key that should be used for the tabernacle, and some suggestions as to precautions that should be taken to protect the Blessed Sacrament from profanation.

RERUM NOVARUM IN THE SAN FRANCISCO STRIKE OF 1901

It has been said that *Rerum Novarum,* the great social encyclical of Leo XIII, was slow in being felt.[1] This may or may not be true, but one thing is sure that in at least one place *Rerum Novarum* was at an early date not only known theoretically, but made a very interesting and impressive appearance in the marketplace. Leo's great encyclical was an oriflamme to rally the hard-pressed ranks of labor in one of the bitterest strikes in San Francisco, and vigorously waving that oriflamme was a priest of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, the Reverend Peter C. Yorke.

When Stalin asked how many divisions has the Pope, he was questioning the power of ideas and ideals. If Stalin could have studied the great San Francisco strike of 1901, he would have seen that the moral force generated by the words of a papal encyclical had a very practical effect. In fact seldom is there found so clear a manifestation of the power of ideas and words to leap from the printed page into fruitful activity.

It is not proposed here to give an exhaustive account of the San Francisco teamsters' strike of 1901, nor even to give a complete account of Yorke's activities in aid of the strikers. To do so would enlarge this study beyond the limits for publication in a journal. Then, too, the story of Yorke's activities in behalf of labor from 1900 to 1910 has been told elsewhere.[2] This study is limited to an analysis of the effect of Leo XIII's encyclical, *Rerum Novarum,* and of the use Yorke made of it in the great strike. But, of course, to understand Yorke's intervention and his use of Leo XIII it is necessary to understand what the strike was all about.

At the turn of the century the United States was harassed by labor troubles. Union labor was still fighting for recognition; working conditions were frequently bad; the living wage was often lacking. In San Francisco unions had been springing up like mush-

[1] E.g., Walter Ong, S.J., "Scholarly Research and Publication in the Jesuit College and University." *Jesuit Educational Quarterly,* XX (Oct., 1957), 81.

[2] Bernard Cornelius Cronin, *Father Yorke and the Labor Movement in San Francisco 1900-1910* (Washington, 1943). This is an excellent doctoral dissertation. It is based not only on written sources, but on personal interviews.

rooms, but a group of businessmen, determined to stop this growth, banded together to form the Employers' Association. The objective of this group was clear: not merely to enable employers to win this or that strike, but to crush the union movement in San Francisco.[3] Emphasis on this objective of the association is necessary to understand Yorke's position in the big strike. This objective was backed by muscle. The association had a war chest of $250,000 and within a few months of its founding, it had helped employers to win several strikes.[4] The future of union labor in San Francisco was seriously threatened. The real test was soon to come.

In July, 1901, the Epworth League held its national convention in San Francisco, and this harmless meeting of Methodist young folk proved to be the Sarajevo of one of the Pacific Coast's fiercest labor wars. The situation was this. The Morton Special Delivery Company was employed to handle the baggage of the convention visitors. This company was a non-union concern. Unable to cope with the amount of hauling necessary to move the Epworth Leaguers' baggage, it called on the Morton Draying Company for assistance. Now the Morton Draying Company was a member of the Draymen's Association which had an agreement with the Brotherhood of Teamsters according to which union teamsters would not be obliged to work for non-union companies. Contrary to this agreement the Morton Draying Company ordered its union teamsters to haul the Epworth Leaguers' baggage for the non-union Morton Special Delivery Company. The union men refused, and as quickly as they refused, they were locked out. Then draying company after draying company ordered their union teamsters to haul the hot baggage until all the union teamsters in San Francisco were locked out.[5] The employers had struck a heavy blow at union labor.

The more intelligent union men were fully alive to their common peril. The City Front Federation called out all its unions in a sympathetic strike. The Sailors' Union of the Pacific, four longshoremen's locals, marine firemen, ship and steamboat joiners, porters,

[3] Selig Perlman and Philip Taft, *History of Labor in the United States 1891-1932* (New York, 1935), p. 72.

[4] Ira B. Cross, *A History of the Labor Movement in California* (Berkeley, 1935), pp. 239 f.

[5] This account of the strike's origin is taken from the *Examiner* (San Francisco), Oct. 3, 1901.

packers and warehousemen, ship clerks, piledrivers and bridge-builders, hoisting engineers, steam and hot water fitters, and coal teamsters joined the Brotherhood of Teamsters to close the ports of San Francisco and Bay Area communities. The unions' demands were simple: reinstatement of the strikers and locked-out teamsters, and an end to the efforts of the Employers' Association to break unionism by boycotting firms using only union labor.[6] The gauntlet flung down by the Employers' Association had been picked up by the City Front Federation. The war was on.

Governor Henry T. Gage and Mayor James D. Phelan tried to bring about peace by mediation; their efforts were wasted. The Employers' Association refused pointblank to enter into negotiations with the labor unions.[7] The issue was squarely joined and was quite evident: the life or death of union labor in San Francisco.

There was no violence at first. Union pickets strove to convert non-union teamsters to union principles. The situation grew worse with the arrival of imported strike-breakers. When these imported strike-breakers mounted the drays and trucks, the strikers' patience quickly wore thin, and violence flared. Mayor Phelan and Chief of Police William P. Sullivan promptly provided full police protection for the employers and their strike-breakers. When they mounted policemen on the strike-breakers' trucks, complaints soon arose that the city was thus left inadequately protected.[8]

To meet this situation, "specials" were sworn in, and then trouble really brewed. The strikers bitterly resented these specials, for they regarded them as a private army for the employers. Casualties mounted as the bitterness increased. By the end of the strike there were five deaths and 336 assaults.[9] As early as August 1, the teamsters were protesting that the police, not content with protecting the strike-breakers, were going out of their way to guide them and show them the best ways of moving their heavy drays around the hilly city.[10]

The employers might have the Mayor and the Chief of Police on their side, but the union men found a powerful champion in the

[6] Taft and Perlman, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 f.
[7] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 12, 1901.
[8] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), August 24, 1901.
[9] Ira B. Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 243.
[10] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 24, 1901.

Reverend Peter Christopher Yorke, a diocesan priest then stationed at St. Peter's. Yorke was born in Galway, Ireland, in 1864. He was ordained in Baltimore by Cardinal Gibbons in 1887, and in 1891 had taken the degree of Licentiate of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America.[11] By 1901 Yorke was a power in San Francisco. He had led the fight against the anti-Catholic American Protective Association, and had done much to defeat the forces of bigotry in San Francisco. Although the priest disclaimed interest in politics as such, his campaign against the A.P.A. in 1896 had contributed much to the election of James D. Phelan as mayor.[12] In 1898 his attack on James McGuire, the Democratic candidate for governor, had led to the election of Henry T. Gage.[13]

It is easy to see, therefore, that Yorke was a force to be reckoned with. His style, whether as a speaker or as a writer, compelled attention. His quick mind soon stripped a question to its essentials and he clothed his logic in language which was often picturesque and always vigorous. Yorke was a controversialist in the vein of the fiery St. Jerome.

Yorke had been quick to appreciate the encyclical *Rerum Novarum,* and when he had been editor of *The Monitor,* the official organ of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, he had instructed the Catholics of the area in correct social attitudes.[14] Now in 1901, only ten years after the publication of *Rerum Novarum,* the principles expressed in that encyclical pushed Yorke into the great strike that was rocking San Francisco, and he boldly proclaimed those principles in the glaring light and terrific heat of a labor war arena.

When the great strike broke out, Yorke at first hesitated to inject himself into the fray. As a parish priest, naturally he had no wish to interfere in an ordinary labor struggle, but as he bluntly told the city:

> At last I became convinced that we were face to face with a most serious condition of affairs, that the labor unions of San Francisco were threatened with extinction, and that a cavalcade of beggars on horseback

---

[11] *The Leader* (San Francisco), April 11, 1925.

[12] Joseph S. Brusher, S.J., "Peter C. Yorke and the A.P.A. in San Francisco," *The Catholic Historical Review,* XXXVII (July, 1951), 149.

[13] McGuire admitted this, *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), Dec. 14, 1898.

[14] E.g., *The Monitor* (San Francisco), XXXVII (1894), Numbers 12, 20, 22, 24.

was formed for the charge to ride roughshod over the wage-earners of this city and state.[15]

Note the reason Yorke gives for entering the fight—"that the labor unions were threatened with extinction." His position is based solidly on the principles of the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. Leo is emphatic on the right of workers to enter associations to promote their welfare.

> The most important of all are workingmen's unions for these virtually include all the rest [means by which workers could improve their position]. . . . It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few associations of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone or of workmen and employers together, but it were greatly to be desired that they should become more numerous and more efficient. . . . to enter into a society of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State has for its office to protect natural rights, not to destroy them.[16]

In this San Francisco case it was not a question of the state forbidding workingmen's associations but of a combination of employers making such associations impossible. It was not this or that grievance or hardship of the workingman, but the principle of labor-unionism itself, that brought the acid-tongued Yorke fighting out of his rectory.

In a speech, "The Rights of Labor," at Sacramento a few months after the strike was over, Yorke gave these reasons for his intervention:

> In the first place have these men no rights? Is free speech to be exercised only when we have nothing to speak about? And why should I not speak for my own?
>
> In the second place is not my citizenship as large? Who are these new masters and on what meat have they fed that they should abridge my rights? In the third place I speak as a priest. I have no desire to separate my identity as a priest and as a citizen. I could not and I would not do as a citizen what it would be wrong for me to do as a priest. My warrant is the head of the church—the Pope.[17]

---

[15] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 25, 1901.

[16] These passages are taken from the edition of *Rerum Novarum* in *The Church Speaks to the Modern World, The Social Teachings of Leo XIII*, edited by Etienne Gilson (New York, 1955), Numbers 49, 51; pp. 231, 232, 233.

[17] *The Leader* (San Francisco), Feb. 1, 1902.

And then Yorke went on to explain *Rerum Novarum.*

Yorke soon found an opportunity to bring these principles into play. On August 6, 1901, M. F. Michael, attorney for the Employers' Association, published an open letter to Mayor Phelan in which he made clear the anti-union attitude of the Association. The letter said that while

> the Association recognizes the right of labor to organize to ameliorate its condition . . . With regard to the adjustment of differences between employer and employee this association has made it clear in the previous correspondence that the settlement of all such differences must be left to the employer and his employees without interference from the officers or members of any labor organization.[18]

Small wonder the union leaders protested bitterly against this. As Michael Casey, President of the Brotherhood of Teamsters, observed, this was to permit unions to be organized—to hold smokers.[19] A few days later, on August 8, 1901, the strikers held a mass meeting at Metropolitan Hall and at this meeting, before a turn-away crowd, Yorke gave Michael an answer.

> The question between the employers and the employees is no longer a question of hours or wages, but it is a question of unionism. Have the men a right to combine in unions? Have such unions the right to treat with employers on the condition of the employed?[20]

In answer to these questions, Yorke brought into the crowded hall the majestic figure of Leo XIII.

> Unions exist by their own right and no state has the right to prohibit them. (applause) To enter into a union of this kind is the natural right of men and the state is bound to protect them.[21]

For months the strike dragged painfully on and still the Employers' Association refused to treat with the strikers.[22] The union men badly needed a lift and Yorke gave it to them. He put his great

[18] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Aug. 6, 1901.
[19] *Ibid.*
[20] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Aug. 9, 1901.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] The board of supervisors voted by a majority of twelve to four that the Employers' Association was responsible for the prolongation of the strike. The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 12, 1901.

talent for oratory and his sharp pen vigorously to work to help the hard-pressed strikers. The two most important needs of the strikers were money and morale. To get money and bolster morale the strike leaders called a mass meeting at Metropolitan Hall. Andrew Furuseth, the leader of the Waterfront Federation and one of the ablest labor men in the Pacific Coast, introduced the featured speaker, Peter C. Yorke. Yorke's reputation as a speaker was great; his name was enough to fill the largest hall. And now he did not disappoint his hearers. In a speech which the *Examiner* reporter prophesied "will become a classic as the most striking defense of human rights that has ever been heard in California,"[23] Yorke first explained that he was fighting for the cause of labor-unionism because he was a priest.

> When I look at what the Catholic Church has done when she stood up against the hucksters of Front Street; when she stood up against kings; when she stood up against emperors; when she stood up against the money powers of all the world and threw a charmed circle around the workingmen and said to the money powers of the world, "Thus far and no further," why should not I, a humble priest of that Church, do my best for the working people.[24]

Yorke called for solidarity among the workers and blamed those unions and union men who would not support the strike. He then became very practical. He earnestly begged every wage-earner in San Francisco to contribute to the strike fund. This was defense, but Yorke loved to carry the war into the enemy's camp. Now he boldly urged the working-class folk of San Francisco to realize their strength and to boycott any firm which belonged to the Employers' Association. The Employers' Association scorned criticism but it was sensitive in its pocket.

> I say to you no matter whether it be store, wholesale shop, newspaper, or other business that is against you in this fight, let every man and every woman, and let every child, too, say to himself or herself, "I will go without . . . rather than patronize such a one." (Applause). . . . If I could only get you people to know this [your economic power], your strike would not last very long.[25]

---

[23] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 22, 1901.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 22, 1901. The boycott was not a new weapon to Yorke. He had used it with some success against the A.P.A. Brusher, *op. cit.*, pp. 135 f.

The evidence at the writer's disposal is not sufficient to show how much this boycott threat helped to end the strike, but, perhaps, it is significant that within two weeks of it, the painful and long-drawn-out strike was over.

While Yorke desired non-violent resistance, he warned the strikers against violence. He also warned them not to place trust in politicians, a warning that was prophetic in view of the inept labor administration of Mayor Eugene Schmitz. Yorke pointed to Mayor Phelan as an example of misplaced trust. Phelan had entered office with professions of sympathy for labor and had turned out to be useless to the workers. As Yorke put it in a homely way: "You might as well have a dish cloth on top of a pole."[26]

And indeed the strikers felt that they had a grievance against Mayor Phelan. A delegation of union men went to the Mayor to complain against the tactics of the police. Mayor Phelan asked them why they did not go back to work. Yorke pounced upon this to paraphrase it in the biting and contemptuous retort: "Get back to work or get clubbed." Phelan promptly wrote to the *Examiner* denying that he had made any such statement.[27]

But Yorke was ready for him. He had a sworn affidavit from Andrew Furuseth claiming that Phelan had said the equivalent.[28]

The newspapers of San Francisco in varying degrees backed the Employers' Association. There was, however, one exception. William Randolph Hearst's *Examiner* threw itself wholeheartedly into the fight on the side of the strikers. In it Yorke's letters were printed; in it his speeches were fully reported; and in it appeared a series of articles by Yorke in defense of the strike and the strikers. On the other hand John D. Spreckels' paper, *The San Francisco Call,* was most hostile to the strikers and it determined to scotch Yorke. *The Call's* attack on Yorke is of peculiar relevance to this study of *Rerum Novarum* in the marketplace for the attack

[26] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 22, 1901.

[27] Yorke's charge, Phelan's denial, and Furuseth's affidavit all appear in the *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 27, 1901.

[28] The three labor leaders who had gone to the Mayor were Michael Casey, Andrew Furuseth and Edward Rosenberg, Secretary of the Labor Council. Michael Casey claimed that Phelan's prepared account of the interview was incorrect. Rosenberg bitterly remarked, "It is just what you could have expected of Phelan, a man controlled by the Employers' Association." *The San Francisco Chronicle,* Sept. 24, 1901.

was directed at Yorke's strongest point. *The Call* charged that Yorke was acting against his Church by his attitude towards the strike.

In a box on top of page four, *The Call* for September 24, 1901, ran a big headline. "Father Yorke's views differ from Prelates of the Church." Then under the box in parallel columns it printed articles dealing with Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishop Riordan.[29] An account of Yorke's latest speech was sandwiched in between the views of the prelates. Alarming! But on reading what these distinguished members of the American hierarchy had to say, one finds no disagreement whatsoever with Yorke's stand on the strike! The only prelate even to mention strikes was Archbishop Ireland who admitted that strikes were necessary and called for charity. The others, Gibbons and Riordan, expressed their grief over the assassination of President McKinley, and flayed the yellow press. The only divergence between the views expressed by these prelates and those of Yorke was that Yorke had, in a manner, defended the local Hearst paper against the attacks of other San Francisco journals. This whole business is an example of unfair journalism.

In the same issue of *The San Francisco Call*[30] there appeared a long letter signed *"Civis"* which took Yorke to task for his stand on the strike. This letter is worth more attention than the blatant attempt to align leading prelates against Yorke by means of misleading headlines. It attacks Yorke just at his strongest and elicited in reply not only a clear statement of Leo XIII's social principles, but a rigorous application of them to present circumstances.

Civis began by paying tribute to Yorke for his gallant fight against the A.P.A. Then he goes on to say:

Now he [Yorke] antagonizes such men as Pope Leo XIII and Archbishop Riordan,[31] sets class against class; while verbally commending

---

[29] The Right Reverend Patrick W. Riordan was Archbishop of San Francisco, and, of course, Yorke's ecclesiastical superior.

[30] *The San Francisco Call,* Sept. 24, 1901.

[31] Bernard C. Cronin on the authority of an interview with the Reverend Patrick McHugh, Aug. 24, 1941, has this to say about Archbishop Riordan's attitude towards Yorke and the strike. "After the lecture of August 8, when Andrew Corrigan of the Employers' Association had asked Archbishop

order in substance incites riots and tumult; and with marked intensity and unexampled bitterness parades himself as the western successor of Father McGlynn of New York.[32]

Civis goes on to say that he is not a Catholic, but he attacks Yorke for backing the strikers: "Because I am a priest of the Catholic Church." He thought Yorke should apologize to various people and then in what might be called the operative sentence of the letter *Civis* said:

> And what [apology] is due for the implied antagonism to the noble encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII in which the reciprocal duties and obligations of all classes have been defined and enforced with a precision, clearness, and sincerity acknowledged or confessed among all civilized nations; in which the toilers of society are warned to "be ever on their guard against riots and the riotous, show inviolate respect for the rights of others, and work willingly and with all due respects for their employers." Almost every sentence of these elevated and inspiring documents could be quoted against the letter and spirit of Father Yorke's ill-considered denunciations.[33]

This is surely an eclectic reading of Leo, and almost ludicrous when the circumstances of the strike are considered. Clearly *Civis* either had not read or chose to ignore the great social principles of *Rerum Novarum.*

Yorke, meanwhile, had planned a series of articles in the *Examiner* and he was quick to take advantage of the remarkably ill-considered attempt of *Civis* to line up Leo XIII against the strike. In an article entitled "On the Mind of the Pope," Yorke gave *Civis* and the public not only a clear exposition of Leo's principles but a strikingly practical application of those principles to the current situation.[34] He once more reminded his readers that the Employers' Association was not fighting this or that union which

---

Patrick W. Riordan to silence the priest, the Archbishop had assured him that Father Yorke was merely explaining the Encyclical of the Pope." Cronin, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

According to Cronin, *Civis* was a man named Henry Highton who had been hired by John D. Spreckels to attack Yorke, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[32] *The San Francisco Call,* Sept. 24, 1901.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 28, 1901.

might at times be unreasonable. It was fighting the principle of labor-unionism.

Why do the rich men organize to destroy the organizations of the poor man? Because the rich men are opposed to unions; they don't believe that the poor men should organize. Now what says the Pope. (*sic*) The Pope comes out plump and plain in favor of unions. In speaking of the means by which the workingmen may better themselves, he says: "The most important of all these means are labor-unions. In fact they include all other means."[35]

Yorke again admitted that there are good unions and bad unions, but he insisted that the question at stake in the present strike was not particular unions but the principle of unionism.

"The Pope says that the principle of unionism is good. The Employers' Association says the principle of unionism is bad."[36]

This is to the point indeed, but Yorke was not finished. He went on to quote Leo:

The ancient workingmen's guilds were abolished in the last century and no other organization took their place. So the workingmen were surrendered all isolated and helpless to the heartlessness and greed of unchecked competition. . . . To this must be added that the hiring of labor and the conduct of trade are concentrated in the hands of comparatively few; SO THAT [capitalization is Yorke's] a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.[37]

Could Pope Leo have described the Employers' Association and the situation in San Francisco better even if he were to make a personal examination of Battery, Davis, and Front Streets? Behold the small number of very rich men! That means the executive committee of the Employers' Association. What are they trying to do? They are trying to lay a yoke on the laborers. Can they succeed: They can succeed if the unions are destroyed. What kind of a yoke? A yoke little better than slavery itself. Can you not hear the crack of Mayor Phelan's whip? . . .

And over the hysterical mouthings of the Mayor, calm, clear, and dis-

---

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] This passage is found in the edition of *Rerum Novarum* cited previously, Number 3, pp. 206 f.

tinct sounds the warning of the Pope: "Thus have the workingmen been surrendered ALL ISOLATED [capitalization Yorke's] and helpless to the hard-heartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition." Workingmen of San Francisco, which will you heed, Mr. James D. Phelan or Pope Leo XIII?[38]

Severe handling of the Mayor! But Yorke gave the reason for his exasperation with city officials. He felt that the city government was not holding the scales of justice even,[39] and he contrasted the conduct of city officials with Leo XIII's beautiful appeal for distributive justice. Indeed he went on to show how Leo claimed that if anything the state should have special care for workingmen.[40]

The *San Francisco Call* and *Civis* had received badly needed instruction in Catholic social principles. No more was heard from that paper about Yorke being at variance with Leo XIII. *The Call* continued to attack Yorke, but now it concentrated on his language and his motives.[41] It cited editorials from other California papers attacking the outspoken priest.[42] Not a bit daunted, Yorke continued his series of articles in *The Examiner*. He attacked *The Chronicle* and *The San Francisco Call* for exaggerated accounts of strike violence.[43] He called Chief of Police Sullivan "a lackey of that mysterious body, the Employers' Association."[44]

At last the employers began to be more reasonable and when on October 2, 1901, Governor Gage[45] once more made a try at mediation, an agreement was reached and the strike came to an end. On the front page of *The Examiner* for October 3 appeared a brief

[38] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 28, 1901.

[39] Besides his remarks in this article in the *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 28, 1901, Yorke in the most violent of his speeches or articles bitterly attacked the city administration for its alleged unfairness to the strikers. The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 26, 1901.

[40] *Rerum Novarum, op. cit.,* Numbers 33, 34, pp. 223, 224.

[41] *The San Francisco Call,* Sept. 26, 27, 30, 1901.

[42] "The most amusing of these attacks was that of C. K. McClatchy of *The Sacramento Evening Bee* in which Yorke was downgraded from Civis' gentle epithet, "the Western successor of Father McGlynn" to "the Jack Cade of Catholicism." *The San Francisco Call,* Sept. 26, 1901.

[43] "On *The Chronicle* and *The Call*," *The Examiner* (San Francisco), Sept. 30, 1901.

[44] "On William P. Sullivan, Jr." *Ibid.,* Oct. 1, 1901.

[45] For Yorke's influence on Governor Gage and his behind the scenes efforts on behalf of the strikers, see Bernard C. Cronin, *op. cit.,* pp. 84 f.

letter from Yorke in which he said, "The strike has ended to the satisfaction of all of us. Thank God. Let us have peace."[46]

The terms of the settlement are not particularly interesting.[47] Face was saved by all parties, but the union men rejoiced as well they might. Whatever the terms, the cold fact was that Yorke's "cavalcade of beggers on horseback" had not succeeded in "riding roughshod over the wage-earners of this city and state." The strike of 1901 made San Francisco safe for labor-unionism.

How had the power of *Rerum Novarum* been manifested in this stormy episode? First of all, no one who has read the speeches and articles of Yorke during the strike can doubt that what brought him into the fray was the papal encyclical. Secondly, the principles of Leo were used repeatedly with luminous logic to defend the strikers' position. And furthermore, these principles were rigorously applied to the concrete circumstances. That they had an effect is clear. If Yorke aided the strikers to defend labor-unionism, it was because of *Rerum Novarum,* and that his aid was effectual can be seen not only from the facts presented in this paper but from the opinion of San Francisco labor leaders. This opinion is clearly expressed by an editorial in *Organized Labor* on the occasion of Yorke's death.

> In the stormy days of 1901 when the San Francisco labor movement was threatened with annihilation, it was Father Yorke who came to the rescue and saved the organized labor movement of this city. In the face of the strongest opposition, in spite of threats and intimidations, when war was declared on the trade-union movement of 1901 and it seemed as if nothing could save the organized labor movement from destruction, Father Yorke, believing that the unions of San Francisco were right, had the courage of his convictions, threw himself into the fray and fought with all his might, and saved the day for organized labor in San Francisco. . . .
>
> . . . In local union labor circles he was recognized as the "Father of the organized labor movement in San Francisco."[48]

Yorke's language may have been impolite, at times even violent, but he certainly made an impact, and by his influence, his advice,

[46] The *Examiner* (San Francisco), Oct. 3, 1901.

[47] Some details on the terms may be found in Selig Perlman and Philip Taft, *op. cit.,* pp. 73 f., and in Bernard Cronin, *op. cit.,* pp. 86 f.

[48] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), April 8, 1925, cited in *The Leader* (San Francisco), April 11, 1925.

his lectures and his writings he largely helped to win a great battle for union labor. But the battle was really larger; it was basically a battle for humanity, and a thoroughgoing application of the great principles of Leo XIII in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*.

JOSEPH S. BRUSHER, S.J.

University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, Cal.

THE DOCTRINAL FUNCTION OF THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

Three documents connected with the Vatican Council bring out with matchless clarity the basic function, not only of that assembly, but of every ecumenical council that has been or will be celebrated within the Church militant of the New Testament until the end of time. These documents are the *Aeterni Patris,* the apostolic letter in which Pope Pius IX convoked the Vatican Council, the *Iam vos omnes,* a letter sent by the same Sovereign Pontiff "to all Protestants and other non-Catholics" who professed to accept Christ as Lord and as Redeemer, and the opening decree of the Council itself.

The *Aeterni Patris,* issued June 29, 1868, contains the following statement:

> Nor have the Pontiffs themselves, neglected when they judged it opportune, and especially in times of the most serious disturbances and calamities for our most holy religion and for civil society, to convoke general councils, so that, by taking counsel with the bishops of the entire Catholic world, whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God, and joining forces with them, they might providently and wisely decree what might be most conducive especially to the definition of dogmas of the faith, to the condemnation of aggressive errors, to the propagation, the explanation, and the more complete statement of Catholic doctrine, to the protection and the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and to the correction of corrupt morals among the people.[1]

The *Iam vos omnes* was sent out Sept. 13, 1868. It explains the functions of the forthcoming Vatican Council in its opening sentences.

> By this time you know well that We, who all undeserving, have been placed upon this chair of Peter, and thus divinely put in charge of the supreme government of and the care for the entire Catholic Church, over which We have been set by Christ Our Lord Himself, have judged it opportune to summon to Ourselves the Venerable Brother Bishops of

[1] In the *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Concilii Vaticani,* edited by the Jesuit Fathers of Maria Laach and published by Herder, in Freiburg-im-Breisgau, in 1892, col. 2.

the entire world, and to gather them into an ecumenical council which is to be held next year. We have done this so that We may be able to take counsel with these same Venerable Brethren who have been called to share in Our solicitude, as to what may be opportune and necessary, both to dissipate the darkness of so many pestiferous errors, which, to the greatest damage to souls, rule and rage everywhere daily, and to build up and increase in the Christian people confided to Our care the kingdom of the true faith, of justice, and of God's true peace.[2]

The third among these statements was the act by which the Vatican Council, at its first session, on Wednesday, Dec. 8, 1869, officially declared itself opened. At this opening session, Antonio Maria Valenziani, the Bishop of Fabriano and Matelica, read the following decree from the pulpit.

The Bishop Pius, Servant of the Servants of God, with the Sacred Council approving, for everlasting memory. Most Reverend Fathers, does it please you, for the praise and the glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the increase and the exaltation of the Catholic faith and religion, for the extirpation of aggressive errors, for the reformation of the clergy and the Christian people, for the common peace and agreement of all, that the Sacred Ecumenical Vatican Council should begin, and should now be declared to be in session?[3]

All of the Fathers of the Council who were present voted *placet*. This was the first official act of the Vatican Council.[4]

All three of these documents speak of the condemnation of doctrinal errors which are harmful to the faith and which are actually current in the Church as an essential concern, not only of the Vatican Council, but of every ecumenical council within the Catholic Church. The *Aeterni Patris* speaks also of dogmatic definitions, and of the propagation, the explanation, and the development of Catholic doctrine. The opening act of the Vatican Council describes this assembly as directed towards "the increase and the exaltation of the Catholic faith and religion." The *Iam vos omnes* states that the council has been called also "to build up and increase in the people confided to Our care the kingdom of the true faith, of justice, and of God's true peace."

[2] *Ibid.*, columns 8 f.
[3] *Ibid.*, col. 32.
[4] Cf. *ibid.*, col. 33.

What these three documents have to say about the doctrinal function of the ecumenical council is illustrated and explained magnificently by a fourth, the introduction to the dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius,* which was issued by the Vatican Council and approved and confirmed by Pope Pius IX during the third session of the Council. The opening paragraph of that introduction shows how the purpose of the ecumenical council was gloriously achieved by the Council of Trent.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Redeemer of the human race, when He was about to return to His heavenly Father, promised that He Himself was going to be with His Church militant here on earth all days, even to the consummation of the world. Hence He has never at any time ceased to be present to His beloved Spouse, to assist it in its teaching, to bless its work, and to aid it when it is in danger. And although this salutary providence of His has always been evident from innumerable other favors, it is especially manifest in those most abundant fruits which have come to the Christian world from the ecumenical councils, and specifically from Trent, despite the fact that this council was held in evil times. For by this [council] the most holy dogmas of religion were more firmly defined and more richly explained. Errors were condemned and repressed. By this ecclesiastical discipline was restored and more firmly sanctioned. Zeal among the clergy for knowledge and for piety was promoted. Colleges were prepared for the young men who were to be educated for the sacred ministry. The morals of the people were restored by a more accurate instruction of the faithful and the more frequent use of the sacraments. From this came a closer union of the members with the visible head and added force for the entire Mystical Body of Christ. From this came a great increase in the number of religious communities and other institutes of Christian piety. From this likewise came an ardor for the propagation of the kingdom of Christ throughout the world which was continuous and constant even to the point of the shedding of blood.[5]

This statement of the benefits actually brought about by or at least on the occasion of the Council of Trent is, in the last analysis, simply a more detailed and complete recounting of the blessings which, according to Pope Pius IX, the Church considers as the basic function of the ecumenical council as such. Here, as in the other three documents, the purpose or function of the ecumenical

[5] *Ibid.,* columns 248 f.

council is described in such a way as to imply that such a gathering is designed primarily for the authoritative instruction of the Church.

In the *Aeterni Patris,* the *Iam vos omnes,* the opening statement of the Vatican Council, and in the introduction to the dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius,* the most immediate purpose of the ecumenical council is always described in doctrinal terms. The *Aeterni Patris* states the doctrinal function of the council as concerned with "what might be most conducive to the definition of the dogmas of the faith, to the condemnation of aggressive errors, to the propagation, the explanation, and the more complete statement of Catholic doctrine." The *Iam vos omnes* inform those to whom it is addressed that the Vatican Council itself is meant to work "to dissipate the darkness of so many pestiferous errors, which, to the greatest damage of souls, rule and rage everywhere daily." The Vatican Council described itself as in session "for the increase and the exaltation of the Catholic faith and religion [and] for the extirpation of aggressive errors." The dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius* listed as the first two accomplishments of the Council of Trent that "the most holy dogmas of religion were more firmly defined and more richly explained," and that "errors were condemned and repressed."

In the light of the teaching contained in all these sources, it is apparent that the *immediate* doctrinal function of the ecumenical council is the clear, adequate, and accurate statement of the divinely revealed truth which the Catholic Church has been commissioned to teach infallibly and to guard faithfully until the end of time. This statement is made in one of two different ways. The Church, in its ecumenical councils, presents this revealed teaching either positively, by an unequivocal assertion of the doctrine itself, or negatively, by the condemnation of an error which contradicts it.

This is brought out with special force in the final words of the introduction to the Vatican Council's dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius.*

> And so We, following in the footsteps of Our predecessors, and in line with Our supreme apostolic office, have never ceased to teach and to guard Catholic truth and to condemn perverse doctrines. And now, with the bishops of the entire world sitting and judging with Us, gathered in this ecumenical council, in the Holy Ghost, by Our authority, basing Ourselves on the written word of God and on tradition, as We have

received it guarded in a holy way and truthfully proposed by the Catholic Church, We have decided, from this Chair of Peter in the sight of all men, to profess and to set forth the salutary doctrine of Christ, the errors opposed to it being proscribed and condemned by the power which God has granted to us.[6]

It is essential that we remember that the positive statement of a doctrine as a truth revealed by God through Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the condemnation of a statement as an error opposed to such a revealed truth, are two distinct means of performing exactly the same function. What is accomplished in both of these two ways is the presentation of a truth precisely as something contained in the body of revelation which God has given to us in His Son. When a statement is anathematized or condemned as heretical, the teaching it contradicts is thereby proposed as Catholic dogma. And, on the other hand, when a teaching is proposed as a dogma of the faith, any contradiction of that teaching is manifested as heretical.

The *Aeterni Patris,* the *Iam vos omnes,* and the introduction to the *Dei Filius* all bring out the fact that this immediate doctrinal function of the ecumenical council also carries with it an enrichment of our knowledge of revealed truth. The *Aeterni Patris* speaks of the ecumenical councils as having been summoned by the Sovereign Pontiffs to issue decrees on what might be conducive "to the propagation, the explanation, and the most complete statement of Catholic doctrine." The *Iam vos omnes* describes the condemnation of errors by the ecumenical council as ordered "to build up and increase in the Christian people confided to Our care the kingdom of the true faith, of justice, and of God's true peace." The opening paragraph of the dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius* states that the Council of Trent had labored to the end that "the most holy dogmas of religion were more firmly defined and more richly explained."

Thus we see that, according to the teaching brought out in these documents, the *immediate* doctrinal function of the ecumenical council may be considered as one act with three distinct effects. Basically it is, in the words of the *Dei Filius,* an action in which the council moves "to profess and to set forth the salutary doctrine

[6] *Ibid.,* col. 250. *Denz.,* 1781.

of Christ, the errors opposed to it being proscribed and condemned by the power which God has granted to Us (*salutarem Christi doctrinam profiteri et declarare . . . adversis erroribus potestate Nobis a Deo tradita proscriptis atque damnatis*)."[7] The immediate doctrinal work of the ecumenical council is, then, the statement of the teaching given by Our Lord Himself as divinely revealed truth. It is definitely not an assertion of truths which have merely developed out of Our Lord's own teaching.

This profession and declaration of Our Lord's teaching by the ecumenical council constitutes, first of all, a dogmatic definition. This most solemn statement by the Church's *magisterium* definitely puts an end to any further legitimate discussion within the Church as to the accuracy of the statements proposed by the council as an expression of Our Lord's own supernatural and revealed teaching. The teaching of the council, like that of the Holy Father speaking *ex cathedra,* is irreformable and irrevocable, not by reason of any subsequent acceptance by the Church itself, but by the authority of the council, confirmed and approved by the Roman Pontiff.

Next, whether it be couched in positive or in negative form, any definition of dogma issued by an ecumenical council is automatically and necessarily a condemnation of errors opposed to this dogma. The negative proposition of a dogma is essentially and explicitly the condemnation of some doctrinal aberration. The positive statement of a dogma, the statement of a truth as part of the salutary doctrine of Jesus Christ, definitely and obviously calls for the rejection and the condemnation of any statement contradictory to or at variance with the teaching set forth as a dogma.

Finally, the definition with its concomitant condemnation of error is also a clarification and an explanation of Our Lord's teaching. As a result of the profession and the declaration of the salutary doctrine of Christ, the people who accept His teaching are benefited by being freed from the danger of failing to appreciate as a part of His message, some truth He had actually taught as God and as God's Messenger. This action, in the light of Our Lord's teaching, is seen as an unmitigated blessing to the people of God.

The consideration of this threefold effect of the single act which is the immediate doctrinal function of the ecumenical council leads us to the knowledge of the central doctrinal function of this assem-

[7] *Ibid.*

bly. This *central* effect, according to the teaching of the documents themselves, can be nothing other than the preservation of the integrity and the vitality of the Catholic faith.

In order to realize this truth, we must take cognizance of the fact that, according to the *Dei Filius,* one of the basic purposes of the existence of the visible Church itself is its function in aiding us to accept and to presevere in the true faith.

> But since without faith it is impossible to please God and to attain to the fellowship of His children, it follows that justification never comes to any man without it, nor will any man attain to eternal life unless he shall have persevered in it until the end. But in order that we may be able to satisfy our obligation of accepting the true faith and of persevering in it constantly, God, through His only-begotten Son, has established the Church, and has equipped it with manifest signs of the fact that He established it, so that it might be acknowledged by all men as the guardian and the teacher of the revealed word.[8]

The Vatican Council has left us a clear and enlightening definition of the true faith. "The Catholic Church," it tells us, "declares that this faith, which is the beginning of human salvation, is the supernatural virtue by which, with the aid and the help of God's grace, we believe those things revealed by Him to be true, not because of the intrinsic truth of the things seen in the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself revealing, who can neither be deceived nor deceive."[9]

For our study the key words in the above declaration are those which state that the true faith is that by which we believe as true the things which have actually been revealed by God. If we give full acceptance to this teaching, we are bound to realize that any misinterpretation of God's revealed message, even on the part of one of the *fideles,* is a serious, although not necessarily a moral, evil. It is lamentably incongruous when, even though no fault of his own, the man who possesses and professes the true Catholic faith is in doubt or in error about any truth contained in the deposit of divine public revelation.

The dogmatic teaching of the ecumenical council, with its statement of the salutary doctrine of Jesus Christ, is calculated to overcome this evil, and to permit the faithful to enjoy the blessing of

[8] *Acta et Decreta,* col. 252. *Denz.,* 1793.
[9] *Acta et Decreta,* col. 251. *Denz.,* 1789.

an accurate and unclouded perception of God's revealed truth. God intends His revealed message to be accepted entirely and as a whole. Only when it is accepted as a whole, in all of its integrity, can it function properly as the guide of the supernatural life which we have through the passion and the death of Jesus Christ. Any factor which tends to obscure one of the truths actually contained in God's revealed message is always objectively an evil. It is something regrettable in itself. Furthermore it is something which is bound to dim the true luster of the Christian supernatural life, for which the divine faith itself is the God-given source of enlightenment. In defining the true content of the deposit of faith, in condemning errors which militate against the integrity of that faith, and in explaining the teaching of Jesus Christ, the dogmatic teaching of the ecumenical council is of the greatest spiritual profit to the people of the living God.

The council in its doctrinal function also works as we have seen for the proper propagation of the Christian faith. And in this line too the integrity of the revealed message is of paramount importance. The ecumenical council works doctrinally for the proper propagation of the Catholic faith by its insistence on the revealed character of truths which, although they actually have been communicated to us supernaturally by God, are least in line with the prejudices and the fashions of the non-Christian world.

In one of the most important and far-reaching doctrinal pronouncements of the nineteenth century, Pope Leo XIII explicitly reproved the error of those who contended "that, in order to attract the wills of the dissidents, it is opportune to pass over certain points of doctrine as of lesser moment, or to soften them so that they no longer retain the meaning which the Church has constantly held."[10] This was the fundamental misconception denounced in the *Testem benevolentiae*. It was the basis of the system known in theology as Americanism. It was likewise at the root of the modernist theory.

Our Lord commanded His apostles to bring to the attention of all nations all the truths which He had imposed upon them. The propagation and the diffusion of the Christian message is an integral part of the doctrinal activity of His Church. Objectively, it is the most ridiculous presumption to imagine that any man has been authorized by God to curtail or to modify His message in order

[10] *Denz.*, 1967.

that this teaching may be made more acceptable or more pleasing to the people for whom Christ died and to whom that message is addressed. Our Lord wills that His message be preached. He does not countenance the diffusion of some body of teaching which is a partial or an erroneous counterfeit of His own.

The ecumenical council, in its doctrinal activity, works against this tendency. The assembled Fathers of the council, gathered under the leadership and the direction of the head of the apostolic college, set forth in the sight of all men the salutary doctrine of Christ. They reprove and condemn, not any theoretical errors, but those which are aggressive and menacing at the very time of their convocation. Thus they function to realize the integrity of the Christian faith in the members of the Church and the integrity of the Christian message which is preached to those who are outside the fold.

The ultimate and crowning purpose of the council's doctrinal activity is thus the glory of the Triune God.

It must be emphasized that this is true in much more than a merely general sense. Glory is clear recognition with praise. The glory of God consists in the recognition of His infinite excellence, and the acceptance and praise of that perfection. The inward glory of God is to be found in the infinitely comprehensive act of His own understanding, which is absolutely identified in reality with His own being and essence, and in the infinitely perfect act of His love for Himself. Obviously nothing that any creature can do in any way contributes to this essential and inward glory of the divine Creator.

The external glory of God, however, consists in the perception of His own supreme and sovereign goodness by an intellectual creature, and in the love or praise which the intellectual creature gives to God whom he knows. Thus the most perfect act in which God receives His external glory is the act of the Beatific Vision, the act in which the creature, elevated by the power of God's grace, understands God directly and immediately in the Trinity of His Persons and in the Unity of His Nature.

This act, in which the external glory of God is ultimately achieved, is the final objective of the entire supernatural life and of the entire supernatural order. And, as a matter of fact, all of the created universe exists precisely in order that it may contribute to the external glory of God, which is thus to be attained in the

clarity and the perfection of the Beatific Vision. Even inanimate objects have being in order that they may be used by rational creatures, strengthened and elevated by the power of God's supernatural grace, for the attainment of that act in which God's external glory is ultimately realized. In the last analysis, all the most recent and the most astounding of the scientific discoveries go to show something of the intrinsic perfection and the complexity of what is in itself an instrument meant to serve God by aiding men to attain Him, to possess Him, and to glorify Him, in the Beatific Vision.

The act of faith, and thus the presentation of those truths which are accepted on God's own authority in the act of faith, have a definite and unique place with reference to God's external glory. In the first place, God is glorified in a perfect, supernatural, and yet preparatory, way in the act of divine faith and in the act of charity which is meant to accompany it. In the act of faith there is a real awareness of God. The man who actually believes the divinely revealed message is certain in his possession of genuine truths about God, as He is known in the Trinity of His Persons and in the Unity of His Nature. The awareness of faith itself constitutes what may be called the groundwork of God's glory. When that faith is accompanied, as it should be accompanied, by divine charity, the man who possesses these virtues and performs these acts really glorifies God.

This point is brought out even more clearly when we consider the reason for the moral necessity of the act of divine faith. The Vatican Council's dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius* tells us that: "Since the entire man depends upon God as upon his Creator and Lord, and since created reason is completely subject to uncreated Truth, we are obligated to give to God revealing the full obedience of intellect and of will by faith."[11] In terms of this teaching, it is easy to realize that the obedience of faith itself constitutes an act in which the rational creature, strengthened and raised up by God's supernatural grace, definitely glorifies God. He gives God the obedience of his faith because he recognizes the fact that he would be failing in his duty as a man were he to refuse this obedience. That service is strictly due to God because we are absolutely dependent upon Him for our very existence and our life. It is likewise due to Him because the truth which God sends to men and which He orders them to

[11] *Acta et Decreta*, col. 251. *Denz.*, 1789.

accept with the assent of divine faith is the very truth which the human mind has been created to perceive and to possess.

The immediate doctrinal function of the Catholic Church, and thus of the ecumenical council within the Catholic Church, is to present this body of teaching which God has revealed and which He wills and commands that men should accept as certain with the assent of divine faith. Any laxity in the presentation of that message is obviously and most seriously derogatory to God's external glory. God is insulted rather than reverenced when men are influenced to accept on His authority some doctrines other than those which He has revealed through His divine Son and which the Catholic Church has been constituted and commissioned to teach and to guard. Likewise the cause of God's glory is adversely affected when men are left in doubt about the status of some truth which God has actually revealed, and which actually forms a part of the Christian message. And finally the cause of God's glory is hurt when the faithful are led to believe that some revealed doctrine can be treated as a question open to discussion within the Church.

The ecumenical council works definitely and directly for the cause of God's glory when it teaches Christ's salutary doctrine in such a way as definitively to settle questions about its meaning and content, and to condemn the current and prevalent errors opposed to that teaching. It works definitely for God's glory when it furthers the cause of the integrity and the vitality of the Catholic faith. The certain and definite teaching of what God has revealed through Jesus Christ is always a good thing, and is always something that contributes to that divine glory for which the created universe has been brought into being.

Especially now, when we are faced with the prospect of another ecumenical council in the very near future, it is well for us to remember these basic truths. During the period of the Vatican Council the faithful were troubled by suggestions that the definition of one dogma of the Catholic faith might be inopportune. They were influenced to imagine that there could be world interests important enough and influential enough to render the full and uncompromising statement of God's revealed message other than fully desirable.

Furthermore, there flourished in those days a kind of doctrinal minimism which encouraged the faithful to look upon definitions

of dogma and upon authoritative doctrinal pronouncements by the ecclesiastical *magisterium* as in some way burdensome and as acts to be avoided as much as possible. Fortunately, that particular way of thinking is no longer explicitly upheld in our own times. But there is always the possibility that its influence may revive.

The clear and certain assertion of the truths revealed by God is not a burden imposed upon the believer. The condemnation of errors opposed to the teachings of the faith is not to be considered in any way as a restriction placed upon human liberty. It is, in the last analysis, the act which the Church, and incidentally the ecumenical council, has been constituted to perform. It is an act conducive to and requisite for the attainment of God's glory.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

A CORRECTION FOR *SACERDOS CAECUTIENS*

In a reply published in the issue of May, 1959, I erred in saying that the *Credo* is never said in the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin offered, by virtue of an apostolic indult, by a priest with defective sight. Having missed or forgotten the new Instruction which appeared in the AAS, L, 51 ff., I relied on a conjecture made by the usually safe authority, J. B. O'Connell, in the latest edition of his *The Celebration of the Mass.* According to the new Instruction, however, the *Credo* is said: (I) Whenever it is to be said in the Mass of the day, according to the calendar of the church in which the Mass is celebrated; and (II) On the anniversary day of the celebrant's ordination to the priesthood. The *Credo* is also added if the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin is celebrated *pro re gravi et publica simul causa.*

The new Instruction departs very little from that of Benedict XV, dated Jan. 12, 1921 (AAS, XIII, 154 ff.); the changes are explained for the most part by the DGRS of March 23, 1955.

CANDLES AT SUNG MASS

Question: In one of the small chapels on a college campus a religious community is using four candles for any *Missa cantata.* Is this practice merely tolerated, or is it entirely proper? Would they be expected to buy two more candlesticks?

Answer: Matters Liturgical, No. 155 f. reads: "For a sung Mass whether high or solemn the six high candles shall be lighted, except in the case of a high or solemn Mass of Requiem for which four candles would be sufficient (S.R.C. 3029, VII). Four candles at high and solemn Masses other than those of Requiem are allowed by some authors (*Eph. Lit.*: LIV, P. 100 AD 7-8); but for this a dispensation from the local Ordinary would seem to be required (S.R.C.: Aug. 18, 1949; AAS: 1949, 476)."

The Decree of Aug. 18, 1949, referred to above, after a brief reference to the scarcity of oil and wax during the two world wars and with a nod to the high prices which still persist, says that "at least four candles should be used for a solemn or high Mass"; the S.R.C. then expresses itself as desirous of having the Most Reverend Ordinaries restore the venerable old tradition. If there is real hardship, I think the religious community would be justified by the decree cited but, if they can spare the money, I think they should buy two more candlesticks. Of course, in the small chapel you describe the six candles need not be so pretentious or "high" as those we expect to find on the main altar of a church.

VIOLET VESTMENTS FOR SOLEMN MASS

Question: Now that we have a new chapel capable of holding the entire student body at a single service, we shall have but one Mass on Sunday, a solemn Mass. If we can, we would like to buy only two vestments for the subdeacon and deacon, not four. The question then is: During Lent and Advent, what would be the more proper thing for the deacon and subdeacon: a) folded chasubles and broad stole? b) Mere albs? c) Tunic and dalmatic?

Answer: If you wish to confine your purchase to two vestments, it would seem that the dalmatic and tunic should be your choice. The regulations of the New Order for Holy Week seem to indicate the disappearance of folded chasubles at some time in the future. Meanwhile, on the Sundays of Advent apart from Gaudete Sunday, and on the Sundays in Lent apart from Laetare Sunday, the deacon would vest in alb, stole, and maniple, and the subdeacon in alb and maniple; this provision is specifically made for small churches where the folded chasubles are not available. If the folded chasuble is not worn, the use of a broad stole is not permitted.

CORPUS CHRISTI PROCESSION

Question: Two local priests have said that the procession on the Sunday following the feast of Corpus Christi is now forbidden. Is this so? Or is it simply tolerated? If there has been a recent change,

I must have missed it in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* which I have been reading faithfully for the past twenty-five years.

Answer: I am not aware of any such prohibition. I wonder if this impression may have been created by confusing some of the regulations bearing on the celebration of Corpus Christi. For example, there is the regulation that the external solemnity of Corpus Christi must be transferred in the United States and celebrated on the following Sunday (*Matters Liturgical,* No. 278, e; 528, c), and the following: "Except where a different practice prevails by virtue of an immemorial custom or where in the prudent judgment of the Bishop local circumstances require otherwise, only one Procession of the Blessed Sacrament along the public streets shall be held on the feast itself of Corpus Christi in one and the same place and this Procession shall be conducted solemnly under the auspices of the church of highest dignity" (*Matters Liturgical,* No. 530). You will note that the procession referred to is one outside the church.

THE "PENANCE" OF A NEW PRIEST

Question: The newly ordained priest is told by the ordaining prelate to say three Masses: a Mass of the Holy Spirit, a Mass in honor of the Blessed Virgin, and a Mass for the faithful departed. Must the first two of these be votive Masses? If they are votive Masses, may they displace a Mass on a feast of double rank?

Answer: Although several authors refer to these Masses as votive, the Pontifical itself does not so designate them. I see no reason why a young man, ordained, let us say, on Ascension Thursday, could not select one of the Masses of Pentecost week to perform the so-called "penance" of offering the Mass of the Holy Spirit. And why could he not likewise select a feast such as that of the Queenship of Mary for the second Mass? To be sure, if he does not offer the Holy Spirit Mass in Pentecost week, he will be obliged to offer it as a votive Mass. When, however, these two Masses are votive, they may not displace a Mass on a feast of double rank but must be offered on days when the ordo permits a votive Mass (S.R.C. 2802, IV).

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES OF A WIFE

Question: If a married woman finds great repugnance in the conjugal act, so that it causes her intense mental anguish to engage in sexual intercourse, is she on that account excused from complying with the requests of her husband?

Answer: It is held by all theologians that if sexual intercourse causes a married woman intense physical pain, she is permitted to refuse her husband's request for the conjugal act. From this it would seem to follow logically that she may act in the same way if intercourse causes great mental suffering. For she is truly afflicted with a psychological disorder, just as painful as any bodily ailment. However, the application of this principle affords many difficulties. It might be used by a woman in order to avoid pregnancy. It is true, she might be unaware of this underlying motive and in perfect good faith believe it is the conjugal act itself which is very repugnant to her, whereas in reality it is the possibility of conception. We might even have this case: A woman found normal childbirth very painful and has an excessive and neurotic fear of going through the ordeal again, even though she is perfectly healthy from the physical standpoint. Will such a fear justify her in refusing her husband his rights, at least during the period when conception is likely to occur? It is certain that a normal dread of the pains of labor will not justify a wife in refusing her husband's request, but the case with which we are considering is concerned with extraordinary fear aroused by an abnormal psychological attitude. It would seem that at times this might excuse a woman from rendering the conjugal debt, but such instances must be regarded as extraordinarily rare. The priest who encounters such a case must not be too ready to declare that a woman is justified in acting in this manner. On the contrary, he should in a kindly way propose arguments to induce her to yield to her husband's wishes, such as the need of confidence in God, the desire she should have to show love for her husband, etc., and at least tell her that she should take means to remedy the psychological condition. A stern approach, such as the declaration that she is guilty of mortal sin, will usually be imprudent. Sometimes the services of a good psychiatrist should be recommended, especially when the priest feels himself incompetent to decide how severe the psychological bloc is.

Probably the most usual cause of such conduct on the part of a married woman is the lack of a proper preparation for marriage. It may be that those who instructed her filled her with revulsion for the conjugal act, or exaggerated the difficulties of childbirth. This may be offset, perhaps, by regular attendance at Cana Club meetings. The perusal of the address of Pope Pius XII on "painless childbirth" might be helpful to a woman who has an excessive fear of this phase of motherhood.

The problem is not sufficiently treated by moralists. Indeed, many do not mention it in their manuals. A brief, but reasonable solution is thus proposed by Lanza-Palazzini: "If, through a psychological condition and neurosis, a wife is beset by a well-nigh insuperable fear of pregnancy or birth, she is to be advised to put aside this timidity; but if there is no hope of success, scruples are not to be aroused" (*Theologia moralis, appendix* [Rome, 1953], p. 95).

RETREAT CONFESSOR AS SUBSTITUTE

Question: When the sisters of a convent make their annual retreat, the retreat-master generally hears their confessions. Does this supply for the services of the ordinary and/or the extraordinary confessor for that week?

Answer: The retreat-master certainly supplies for the services of the ordinary confessor during the time of the retreat, at least for the sisters who are making the retreat. By exception, however, the ordinary confessor would have to come to the convent, if one of the sisters wished to confess to him, unless it would involve extraordinary inconvenience. The same is true of one of the supplementary confessors (Can. 521, § 2). I do not believe, however, that the retreat-master would supply for the extraordinary confessor, who is bound to come to the convent at least four times a year (Can. 521, § 1), in the sense that, when the convent has had the services of a retreat-master in the course of the year, the extraordinary confessor would be obliged to come only three times. Even if the retreat is held at a time when the extraordinary confessor normally comes (for example, at Embertide), I believe that he should then come at some other time so that he will fulfil literally the prescription of the Code, to present himself for the sisters' confessions at least four times a year.

WAS OUR LADY EVER SICK?

Question: Is it correct to assert that the Blessed Virgin Mary was free from illness all her life? If that be the case, what was the cause of her death?

Answer: It is a sound theological opinion that the Blessed Virgin Mary never suffered from any particular bodily defects, such as particular forms of sickness. The same was true of Our Lord. The basic reason is that, in the present order of fallen nature, particular bodily defects are the result of original sin. We say *particular* bodily defects, because bodily afflictions which are the common lot of mankind, such as thirst, hunger, fatigue, etc., were endured by Mary as well as by her Divine Son (cf. St. Thomas, *Summa,* IIIa, p. 14, art. 4). Now, since Mary, like Christ, was free from original sin, she, like Him, was immune from all particular bodily defects, including ailments, such as tuberculosis, heart disease, etc. As to the cause of her death (if she actually did die, which is a controversial question), it was probably due to an ardent act of love which, so to say, forced her soul to leap from her body. These ideas are brought out in a chapter entitled "Our Lady's Endowments" by Rev. Dr. P. Rhodes, in the published papers of the Cambridge (England) Summer School of 1933, under the general title *Our Blessed Lady* (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1934). He writes: "Nor are we to imagine that her body was to be subjected to the corruption of sickness, even in her later years.... Her death, in any case, was due, neither to old age nor to disease; an ecstatic act of the love of God, bursting through the capacities of the human body, has been commonly suggested as its cause" (pp. 173 f.). A more recent author, Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., goes into greater detail, proving that none of the causes of particular diseases could be in Mary—inherent bodily weakness, personal fault, inheritance, or external agents. He cites Gerson and Cajetan in support of this opinion (*Compendium Mariologiae,* Rome, 1946, pp. 417 f.).

INVISIBLE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH

Question: If an unbaptized person in good faith acquires the state of grace by an act of divine charity, can we say that he is an invisible member of the Church?

Answer: Such an expression is inaccurate. We know from pronouncements of the Church, especially from the Encyclical *Mystici corporis,* that "only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority." Again, Pope Pius XII added "it is clear, We think, how grievously they err who arbitrarily picture the Church as something hidden and invisible." Hence, there is no such thing as an "invisible member of the Church." The person described by our questioner can be said to be *united* (or *related*) to the Church by implicit desire.

A question very similar to this was answered in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1958. However, since the topic has very important ramifications, and since apparently not all our readers are familiar with the answer, it is repeated in this issue.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

ELEVEN YEARS OF BIBLE BIBLIOGRAPHY. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Indian Hills, Col.: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1957. Pp. vii + 804. $7.50.

This is not a complete bibliography of everything published from 1945 to 1956. As explained on the title page, this is "The Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study." To have included "brief abstracts of articles" dealing with Biblical matters "would have enlarged the List beyond the resources" of the Society. The scope of the work is more limited: notices of books and pamphlets in a great variety of languages, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, for the most part, but also some more unfamiliar languages as Catalan, Dutch, Czechoslovak, Finnish, the Scandinavian languages and modern Hebrew. The books reviewed cover all the fields of Biblical study; General and Special Introduction, questions of literary and historical criticism, Grammar and Philology, Text and Versions (including modern translations); Archaeology, the neighbors of Israel, Post-biblical Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls. The reviews were contributed by 70 well-known scholars who treat the subjects quite fairly and, though briefly, in a manner which allows the reader to get a clear idea of the contents and value of the books. One can see from the 14-page index of Authors' names the large number of works analyzed in this volume. Little of any real importance has escaped the attention of our scholars. The review of each volume is accompanied by indications of the places of publication, price etc. which enable one to procure the works. The present reviewer may say that thanks to the "Bible Bibliography" he was able to obtain several works which he had been advised by booksellers had not appeared or were unobtainable for some reason. It is a great pleasure to recommend this very practical publication as really valuable and helpful.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME. By Monsignor A. G. Martimort. Translated by Aldhelm Dean, O.S.B. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1958. Pp. 217. $3.25.

In contrasting the Faith and the illiteracy of the Christians of the Middle Ages with that of the indifference to the Faith and the literacy

of the twentieth century Catholic it has been said that the present day American Catholic is a literate Catholic but a Catholic illiterate.

The author is the director of the Pastoral Liturgy Centre in France and the editor of its review, *La Maison-Dieu.* In his preface to this book Msgr. Martimort states that it is for Christians who take their part in the Church's prayer (the Liturgy) and who use a Missal. However, it is the opinion of this reviewer that it presents an excellent opportunity for the Catholic illiterate to become literate.

Even for the uninitiated, liturgically speaking, it should not be a difficult book to read and understand. The author is like an experienced guide taking a visitor through a strange city, who, while pointing out the obvious with the mysterious and the unknown, gives a history and commentary about the city and its peoples and customs—meanwhile walking along the thoroughfares and mingling with the crowds. It is a carefully planned and guided tour through the City of God in the world by means of which the reader can learn to make himself at home and to follow this way of life of the Christian in the modern universe.

Orientated by the chapter on the "Assembly of Prayer" and that of the interpretation of the words and gestures used in this assembly, the reader is prepared for the chapters concerning the Sacraments, Sunday as the day of the Lord, the year of the Lord, and the church and the altar. These chapters are followed by ones that become more detailed and specialized: The Mass as the Liturgy of the Word of God, The Eucharistic Liturgy, The Sacraments of Initiation (Baptism, Confirmation, First Communion), and the various other Sacraments. After the special topics of each chapter are discussed a summary is given; this is concluded by a "reading"—a selection from some writer or liturgical book pertinent to the chapter.

This book is outstanding among books of this nature and could be correctly described as a handbook for the Christian home as well as for an individual Christian.

PASCHAL BOLAND, O.S.B.

SHAPING THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE. Essays in Religious Education. Edited by Gerard S. Sloyan. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. Pp. xi + 327. $5.50.

"Complaining against children's catechisms is an old business. It can be a tiresome one. Yet every Christian has the freedom to work for the improvement of a situation in the Church provided he has the

needed knowledge and can bring his reforms to the attention of those who have jurisdiction." It is in the spirit of these wise words of introduction that *Shaping the Christian Message* has been written. This is a valuable book, and we are grateful to Father Sloyan for making these essays available to us and for arranging them into a well organized whole.

When men have long since made their marks as experts in their chosen fields, the mere appearance of their names on the cover of a book is pretty much a guarantee of its worth. Here is a case in point. For those who are impressed by important names this book is certainly a must! The list of contributors draws upon the acknowledged leaders in the field of religious education in England, Belgium, France, Austria, and the United States. The American authors include Father Sloyan himself, Fathers Gustave Weigel and John A. Hardon of the Society of Jesus, and Father J. J. McGuire of the University of Notre Dame.

Shaping the Christian Message is divided into three parts. The five chapters of Part I, "An Historical Perspective," although clearly not exhaustive in scope, nevertheless present a relatively complete picture of the teaching of religion through the centuries. Father Jungmann's "Religious Education in Late Medieval Times" (chap. 2), for example, is a gem: clearly and interestingly written, it provides both a wealth of factual information and a sympathetic yet objective evaluation of an immensely complicated period of human and ecclesiastical history, about which many have been prone to pontificate in broad and inaccurate generalizations. Again, this reviewer found Father Crichton's "Religious Education in England in the Penal Days" (chap. 3) deeply moving and inspiring. The figure of Bishop Challoner, as delineated by Father Crichton, emerges as that of a learned and selfless man of God, remarkably atuned to the great "Tradition" of the Church concerning the teaching of religion. For those of us who were inclined, perhaps, to smile condescendingly at the mention of the "Garden of the Soul," it is an awakening to learn that as it came from the pen of its author this famous prayerbook deserves nothing but our admiration and praise. "The tone of the book is one of sobriety and it is markedly scriptural. Psalms are suggested both for holy communion and for confession, and it is a great pity that later editions reduced or omitted these elements" (p. 84). For those, too, who would be inclined to consider all the principles and aims of modern catechetics as brilliant *new* insights, it is well to note that Bishop Challoner's catechism was a model of simplicity, free from the "itch for theology" which plagued the nineteenth century revisers of his work. The word "supernatural," we are told, never

once occurred in the original catechism. To the question "What is God?" Challoner answered: "He is the Maker and Lord of Heaven and Earth." Before a century had gone by, this simple, concrete answer was replaced by: "God is the supreme Spirit, Who alone exists of Himself and is infinite in all perfections." All change is not necessarily progress!

Part II treats of "Some Theological and Scientific Considerations." Here "The Meaning of Sacred Doctrine in the College" by Father Weigel (chap. 8) is an important contribution to the much discussed question of the teaching of religion at the college level. College religion should be, indeed, a *theology,* that is, a contemplation. But because the very purpose of the undergraduate college program is to give the student a broad humanistic formation—he is being taught "to know and esteem the good" rather than to be an expert in a particular field —the theology which he is given should not be the strictly scientific theology of the university school of divinity. "We must present the Gospel not exclusively as truth but as salvation" (p. 176). College theology, therefore, should be expository rather than controversial, selective (with great stress on the doctrine of the Mystical Body) rather than universal in scope, and, finally, actively related to the present life of the student.

Part III is concerned with a number of special problems united under the heading of "Practical Considerations." In this final section of the book Fr. Georges Delcuve, S.J., editor of the international catechetical review *Lumen Vitae,* contributes a particularly stimulating essay entitled "Confirmation at the Age of Reason" (chap. 13). Theologians as well as catechists should take note of this brief but pointed exposition of the history, purpose, and nature of a sacrament which, in this country at least, is still far from properly understood.

FRANK B. NORRIS, S.S.

WORLD CRISIS AND THE CATHOLIC. Edited by Sheed and Ward. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1958. Pp. xiv + 231. $3.00.

A collection of essays on the world situation might easily turn out like so many aspirin tablets attempting to cure world headaches. *World Crisis and the Catholic* is no such sedative. Catholic lay men and women, many of them world leaders in politics, education, and science, have taken a look at the world, and, writing in the context of their respective vocations in that world, have given a Christian diag-

nosis of what they see. Without sounding like a blurb for patent medicine, much of what they say is good prescription for a sick modern world.

Twenty contributors offer writings differing in length and quality. Most are good; a few are outstanding. The essays are loosely grouped under the headings: Science and Technology; Art in the Technological Age; World Community; Church of All Nations; and, as a sort of prologue, Two Thousand Years Afterwards. The essays are not as formidable as the section headings might indicate.

Konrad Adenauer writes on the place of spiritual principles in politics. He indicates without explaining the practical ways to integrate Christianity with modern government. Wladimir D'Ormesson, of France, claims that the re-emergence of Catholic leadership in European politics is due to a restudy of principle by Europeans. The challenge, he says, is to meet our responsibilities with wisdom, courage, imagination, and faith.

In the section on world government, Marga Klompe, of the Netherlands, offers concrete plans for the supranational community. Kotaro Tanaka, of Japan, in one of the book's best selections, says that world peace depends on world government, which in turn hinges on law. The brilliant Japanese professor of law offers a cogent criticism of Reves' concept of world government, maintaining that internationalism is not opposed to world political society. He admits with Reves that sovereignty causes conflicts, but says it must be yielded gradually, not by revolution.

Raymond Scheyven, Belgian member of Parliament, has an alarming essay on the state of the world's underprivileged nations. He offers a frank and disturbing appraisal of the attractiveness of Communism to nations in poverty.

John Wu gives a common theme a deeper insight when he tells why East and West must find their meeting place in Christ. Christopher Dawson demonstrates that the core of what we call Western in Christianity has had influence from the East, and can easily become universal to the world.

Mutara III, King of Uganda, shows a deep understanding of his native people coupled with a grasp of the nature and role of the Church, in his essay: *What the African Soul Seeks from the Church.*

In some cases the book teaches, as when Karl Stern examines the problem of hatred in the light of his knowledge of medicine and psychology. In other cases what the authors say is not entirely new to the reader. But when Francesco Severi and Lopez-Ibor, for example,

speak on science and religion, we are getting more than a re-hash of cliches. Even when an author says comparatively little, the reader, nevertheless, is becoming acquainted with an outstanding Catholic leader.

Sheed and Ward has not given us a how-to-do-it manual on solving world crises. Those are the writings of Catholics who have thought about world problems as Christ would want them to. Gertrude Von Le Fort, whose poem is on the final page, puts in the mouth of God the words: "Come, my children, and be my witnesses." *World Crisis and the Catholic* is an answer to that plea.

JOHN P. BRENNAN, C.S.P.

THE SECULAR JOURNAL OF THOMAS MERTON. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959. Pp. xv + 270. $3.75.

This book contains a few selections taken from the diary Thomas Merton kept when he was a layman. The entries date from October 1, 1939 to November 27, 1941. At that time he was already a convert to Catholicism. He was employed as a teacher in University Extension at Columbia and later as an Instructor at St. Bonaventure's. Some editing has been done, yet the spontaneity of the original diary has been preserved. The author suggests that, "Perhaps some readers may feel that the book is still intolerable. If so, we heartily regret the fact. In any case, the careless style, the callow opinions and all the other defects are those of a writer much younger and even more unwise than I am at present" (p. viii). We did not find the book intolerable. Assuredly there is not much intrinsic importance to the subject matter itself. It rambles on about paintings at the World's Fair, book-hunting in Cuba, a visit to Cincinnati, Holy Week at Gethsemani etc. As for the style, "careless" is really a complimentary term. Long, clumsy sentences abound. There is one veritable monster containing exactly 104 words. However, all of these defects of content and style must be expected in a diary which is written in spontaneous spurts on a day-to-day basis. They do not prevent this book from being most interesting for the light it sheds upon the author.

Here is a new Catholic, earnestly seeking for the best way to serve God; a new teacher trying to become a writer; a brash young man with a catalogue of categorical judgments on the world. Here also is a soul responding to grace, being drawn irresistibly to the cloister. This is not the monk of 1959; but it reveals some of the raw material

that went into the making of that monk. There is pleasant, sometimes humorous reading here, especially for those interested in the remarkable history of Thomas Merton.

JOHN J. KING, O.M.I.

Books Received

MON FRÈRE ANTOINE: VIE ET FIORETTI DE SAINT ANTOINE DE PADOUE. By Pierre Salvator. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1959. Pp. 149. 700 francs.

A MANUAL OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By Ad. Tanquerey. Translated by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Byrnes. New York: Desclee Company, 1959. Pp. xix + 436, and xv + 462. $9.75. This is a translation of Tanquerey's famous *Brevior synopsis*, in the later edition edited by Father Bord.

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE SANCTAE ET OCTAVAE PASCHAE DUM CANTU IUXTA ORDINEM BREVIARII MISSALIS ET PONTIFICALIS ROMANI. Editio typica. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis. Pp. xxiii + 736 + 31. Price not given.

THE NOTION OF TRADITION IN JOHN DRIEDO. By John L. Murphy Dissertatio ad lauream in Facultate Theologica Pontificae Universitatis Gregorianae. Milwaukee, 1959. Pp. xiv + 321. $3.00.

TWO JAPANESE CHRISTIAN HEROES: JUSTO TAKAYAMA UKON AND GRACIA HOSOKAWA TAMAKO. By Johannes Laures, S.J. Rutland, Vermont, and Tokyo, Japan: Bridgeway Press, 1959. Pp. 128. $2.50.

ÉCRITS SPIRITUELS ET PAROLES DE L'ABBÉ HUVELIN. DOCUMENTS INÉDITS. Recueillis annotés par M.-Th. Louis-Lefebvre. Preface de Son Excellence Monseigneur Blanchet. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1959. Pp. 198. No price given.

NEUES TESTAMENT übersetzt und erklät von Otto Karrer. Munich: Verlag Ars Sacra Josef Müller, 1959. Pp. 818. DM 11.80.

PAROCHIAL RELATIONS AND CO-OPERATION OF THE RELIGIOUS AND THE SECULAR CLERGY. A HISTORICAL SYNOPSIS AND A COMMENTARY. By David O'Connor, M.S.SS.T. The Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies, n. 401. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958. Pp. xiv + 195. $2.00.

THE ABSOLUTE BEING. By Jorge Tallet. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. Pp. 74. $3.00.

ORDINATION IN SOCIETIES OF THE COMMON LIFE. A HISTORICAL SYNOPSIS AND A COMMENTARY. By John G. Nugent, C. M. The Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies, n. 341. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958. Pp. x + 233. $2.00.

HISTOIRE DOCUMENTAIRE DE LA CONGRÉGATION DES MISSIONAIRES OBLATS DE MARIE-IMMACULEÉ DANS L'EST DU CANADA. 1re Partie. De l'arrivée au Canada à la mort du Fondateur (1841-1861). Tome II. By Gaston Carrière, O.M.I. Ottawa, Canada: Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1959. Pp. 344. No price given.

THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO AFFECTING CHURCH PROPERTY. By Manuel J. Rodriguez. The Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies, n. 406. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959. Pp. xii + 221. $2.00.

THE MORALITY OF MEDICAL EXPERIMENTATION ON LIVING HUMAN SUBJECTS IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS. By John Joseph Shinners. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology. Second Series, n. 106. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958. Pp. 109. $1.25.

A PRACTICAL FORMULARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CANON LAW. By Rev. Stanley Pietrzyk. Rome: Officium Libri Catholici-Catholic Book Agency, 1959. Pp. xv + 278. No price given.

FLAME OF WHITE. A LIFE OF SAINT PIUS X. By William Hunermann. Translated from the German by M. Ida Adler, Ursuline of the Roman Union. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1959. Pp. 269. $4.50.

CHURCH AND STATE IN MARITAIN'S THOUGHT. By Anicetus Tamosaitis, S.J. Submitted as a doctoral dissertation in the Faculty of Theology Gregorian University, Rome. Chicago: 2345 West 56th Street, 1959. Pp. 123. No price given.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. AN HISTORICO-JURIDICAL STUDY. By Austin P. Bennett. In the Analecta Gregoriana. Series Facultatis Iuris Canonici, n. 98. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1958. Pp. vii + 203. $3.50.